



## **Rejecting Freedom and Progress :A Case Against Capitalism**

**By : Dr.Jawaid Akbar Ansari.**

This Article Has been Taken From Journal  
Jareeda :29 ,Published by Karachi  
University ,Press by the permission of  
"Syed Khalid JAmie" Direcor ,Ku Press to  
"Mr.Muhammad Ali junaid" ,The Research  
Scholar ,Karachi University for Intellectual  
Dissemination and publishing Online .

April/2016

**Compiled ,Edited and formatted By :**

**"Muhammad Ali Junaid "**

**Research Scholar, Department of Political Science,Ku.**

Karachi University Research Forum

[www.kurf.page.tl](http://www.kurf.page.tl)

[majunaid@live.com](mailto:majunaid@live.com)



## Table Of Content

S.No	Titles	PP.NO
1.	Acknowledgments	2
2.	Table of Contents	3
3.	Chapter 1:INTRODUCTION	4
4.	Chapter 2:Summary: Capitalist Individuality	6
5.	Summary: Capitalist Individuality	17-20
6.	The Market	20
7.	Summary: The Market	31-32
8.	Civil Society and The State	33
9.	Summary: Civil Society and the Capitalist State	39-40
10.	America and Global Capitalist Order	40
11.	America and Global Capitalist Order	40
12.	Summary: America and Globalization	51=52
13.	Chapter 3: Justifying and Governing Capitalism	53
14.	The Genealogy and Telos of the Social Sciences	53
15.	The Geneses and Telos of the Social Sciences: A Summary	56-57
16.	Economics	57
17.	Summary: Economics and Capitalism	71-74
18.	Political Science	74
19.	Summary: Political Science and Capitalism	87-92
20.	Marxist Social Theory	92
21.	Summary: Marxist Social Theory and Capitalism	103-104
22.	Chapter 4 :Legitimizing Capitalism: Islamization of Social Sciences	105
23.	Islamic Economics and Maulana Taqi Usmani	105
24.	Summary: Islamic Economics and Capitalism	113-115
25.	Islamic Constitutionalism and Maulana Maududi	115
26.	Summary: Islamic Constitutionalism and Capitalism	119-121
27.	The Sociology of Islamand Allama Shariati	121
28.	Summary: Islamic Sociology and Capitalism	127=129
29.	Chapter 5 Overthrowing Capitalism; A Ghazalian Perspective	130
30.	Notes	137-142
31.	Capital: Appendix 1: An Islamic Appreciation of Pakistani Modernism: Ideology, Methodology and Strategy*	143
32.	Modernist Ideology in Pakistan	144
33.	Materialist: Pro Imperialist: Anti Islam	148
34.	Methodology	148-155
35.	Policies	156
36.	Pakistani Modernists' Policy Recommendations	158
37.	Conclusions	158-159
38.	Appendix 2:Marxist Ideals	161-164
39.	References	165=175
40.		

Note : Each and Every Research and their conclusion ,opinion and Expressions solely Reflects Authors USP's ,so Author are Responsible for their own research's and Point of Views, Therefore it is not necessary that **KURf** agrees with each and every Argument and opinion Expressed By Authors.

## Acknowledgments

---

The material in this book was prepared for extension lectures given at the Sheikh Zayed Islamic Centre University of the Punjab in 2002 and 2004.

I am deeply grateful to Prof. Dr. Jamila Shaukat, Director Sheikh Zayed Centre University of the Punjab for inviting me to give these lectures and for her gracious hospitality. I also thank Hafiz Abdullah and Mr. Ishtiaq Gondal for their guidance and support. I am also obliged to participants at a University College of London seminar on late capitalism held in July 2004 for comments on my paper which has been incorporated in chapter three of this book.

I thank the National Institute of Public Administration Karachi for permission to reproduce as Appendix 1 a paper which was first published in that Institute's journal.

The ideas presented here have been developed by a group which has met regularly, since January 1992 at the Islamic Research Academy Karachi to study modernist / post modernist thought. This group includes Ali Muhammad Rizvi, Abdul Wahab Suri, Idrees Ismail, Muhammad Younus Qadri, Ghulam Geelani Khan, Zeeshan Arshad, Habib ur Rehman, Muhammad Tahir, Mahbub Hasan, Javed Iqbal and myself. Although my name appears as author we are all equally responsible for this book.

Finally I would like to thank Mr. Abdul Qadeer Bukhari for his patience and skillful editing and compilation from a badly written manuscript.

Javed Akbar Ansari, August 2004

## **Table of Contents**

---

### **Chapter 1: Introduction**

### **Chapter 2: Capitalist Order**

#### **2.1. Capitalist Individuality**

#### **2.2. The Market**

#### **2.3. Civil Society and The State**

#### **2.4. America and Global Capitalist Order**

---

### **Chapter 3: Justifying and Governing Capitalism**

#### **3.1. Genealogy and Telos of the Social Sciences**

#### **3.2. Economics**

#### **3.3. Political Science**

#### **3.4. Marxist Social Theory**

### **Chapter 4: Legitimizing Capitalism: Islamization of Social Sciences**

#### **4.1. Islamic Economics**

#### **4.2. Islamic Constitutionalism**

#### **4.3. The Sociology of Islam**

### **Chapter 5: Overthrowing Capitalism; A Ghazalian Perspective**

### **Appendix 1: Pakistani Modernism**

### **Appendix 2: Marxist Ideals**

### **References**

---

## Chapter 1

---

### *INTRODUCTION*

The September 11 counterattack on America has created a crisis of legitimacy for the West. The collapse of communism had recreated faith in Hegel's hope of "an end of history" and of the final triumph of capitalism. The counterattack on the Twin Towers seeks to refute this faith.

Can capitalism be transcended? Is capitalist order natural or merely historical? At least until the rise of Gorbachev most Marxists seemed to believe in the possibility – perhaps the inevitably – of the transcendence of capitalism. This belief seems to have been abandoned by all socialists, even by China and Cuba and the CPI (M) which rules India's Bengal. These regimes mimic the market, welcome Western cultural imports and institutionalize democratic practices.

The socialist challenge to the capitalist system as a whole has disappeared – although post modernist single issue movements, (anti globalization, feminism, gay rights, environmentalism, all partly influenced by socialist thought) continue to appose isolated aspects of capitalist order. Transcending capitalist order – its norms, regulatory regimes transactional forms – is not on the agenda of any of these single issue movements. Is it on the agenda of Islamic revolutionaries? Huntington seems to think it is, for he speaks of "a clash of civilizations" (it is one of the great merits of Huntington's work that he implicitly equates Western "civilization" with capitalism). Others (e.g. Roxana Euben, Joseph Nye) speak of a "civil war in Islam" in which the West has become entangled reluctantly. Does this "civil war" pose a threat to the existence of capitalism as a world order? What sort of state will the Mujahideen establish, a national Islamic state seeking its "rightful" place in global capitalist order? Or a universal state threatening capitalism with permanent revolution?

There is certainly an intellectual divide, if not a "civil war"-in the Muslim world. A sizeable proportion of the Muslim intelligence sees capitalist order as natural and subordination of Islam to capitalist order as inevitable (indeed desirable). Most of the leaders of Muslim thought – the ulema and the soofia – are non committal. They do not fully appreciate capitalism as a world order and are somewhat confused and bewildered by the systemic challenges posed by the Mujahideen. A microscopic minority of Muslim thinkers is beginning to theorize the Islamic struggle against capitalist world order. This book seeks to make a preliminary statement of the Islamic case against capitalism.

We Muslims would like to understand the West's claims about the universality and necessity of its fundamental modes of historical experience, its claims that there are no alternatives to capitalism and democracy.

This book begins by describing the conception of the self that was developed by the Enlightenment philosophers. It situates this self in capitalist order by describing this order in brief detail at the level of the market, civil society and the state. The relationship of the market and the state in globalizing capitalism is described and the crucial role played by America in sustaining this order is evaluated.

Chapter three focuses upon three social sciences – economics, political science and social theory – which are based on Enlightenment ontological and epistemological assumptions and which justify capitalist order. This discussion also illustrates how these social sciences provide a technology for the governance of capitalist markets, societies and states.

Chapter four analyzes the Islamic response to the universalization of capitalist order. It shows that Islamic movements have adopted a revisionist approach, seeking to accommodate Islamic practices within capitalist order. Islamic economics and Islamic constitutionalism are typical revisionist responses leading to a legitimization of capitalist discourses and policies on Islamic grounds. They also facilitate the development of a governance technology which subordinates Islamic movements and regimes to capitalist order. The sociology of Islam as developed by Ali Shariati seeks a similar legitimization of Marxist theory and practise on Islamic grounds.

The book ends with a plea for the total and final rejection of capitalism and democracy. Such a rejection requires a revival of the classical Islamic sciences – fiqh, kalam tafseer and tasawuf. The scope of the applications of the principles (usul) enunciated by these sciences should be broadened and ahkam should be derived for an evaluation of the capitalist system as a whole. Evaluation of individual capitalist practices – financial transactions, social stratification rules, electioneering – should be contextualised by an over arching evaluation of the entire capitalist life world. This requires a revival of Islamic orthodoxy. The on going revolutionary struggle for the overthrow of capitalism makes such an epistemological revival both possible and necessary. Muslim scholars must build upon Imam Ghazali's methodologies for achieving a final refutation of capitalist discourse and practise.

## Chapter 2

### Capitalist Order

#### *2.1. Capitalist Individuality*

Enlightenment philosophy identifies the essential characteristics of capitalist used to deal society. Enlightenment philosophy presumes a human self capable of knowing and governing the world without dependence on any transcendental non human source. This claim is founded on the Enlightenment's conception of rationality. Abstract truths "discovered" through deductive and empiricist enquiries can provide an adequate answer to all ontological questions. This is the essential dogma underlying Enlightenment rationality.

Reason - the capability to discover ontological truth through deductive and empiricist methodologies - is seen as the fundamental core of human nature, which makes universal agreement possible. Enlightenment reason requires that 'the pursuit of happiness' be accepted as the sole purpose of the organization of individual and social life. Human progress (attainment of higher levels of happiness) is regarded as inevitable for it is a consequence of human self-realization. The pursuit of human happiness requires a universal rationalization of moral norms and social practices. But this universalization implies not domination but autonomy. For everyone has equal access to reason and "ought" to reach the right (same) conclusions regarding norms and practices. Agreement on universal truths could be achieved by "inter-subjective" communication among antecedently individuated autonomous citizens.

These universalistic claims were challenged even in the eighteenth century not only by Romantics but even by Hume who showed that reason and experience could not justify the existence of the world outside our experience. He wrote, "Reason is and ought to be the slave of the passions" (1951 p. 451). This is a central theme of the Romantic movement, which like the Enlightenment believes in the individual's personal access to truth. In the Romantic tradition intuition takes the place of reason as the source of self-realization. As both Hume and Rousseau show this is not a repudiation of reason. Reason's instrumental value is affirmed. It must continue to serve as "the slave of the passions'. That is why Hume and Rousseau can both be regarded as figures straddling Enlightenment and Romanticism.

Romanticism's enduring contribution to the Enlightenment project lies in its conceptualisation of an "inner self". Both Rousseau and Kant insist on the necessary goodness of the self - it is good even when it wills evil (Rousseau 1954 p. 73). Hence the Romantic endorsement of autonomy for willing evil does not negate the goodness of the self. The foundations of democracy and capitalism are rooted in the contracting activity of necessarily (by definition) good autonomous selves. These contracts create "the general will which tends always to the preservation and the welfare of the whole and of every part" (Rousseau 1954 p.17) and is therefore always necessarily good (despite its autonomous willing of evil)<sup>i</sup>.

The self<sup>ii</sup>, says Kant “does not derive its laws from but prescribes them to nature” (1954 P67) for it “possesses an order which is fixed and immutable in all of us “(p. 73) Kant agrees with Hume that the world is not “out there” but “in us”. The individual knows the world because the self determines the structure of his experiences - that is the meaning of Kant’s assertion that “objects must conform to knowledge” (1996 p. 75). The self acts upon the world to give it form and meaning. The self imposes the one possible set of structures upon the world, which it has discovered by categorizing its sensations to recognize objects and their relations (Kant’s understanding) and by developing concepts on the basis of such ‘ understanding’. The self is thus the basic source of all experiences and concepts. Kant describes it as “transcendental” in that it is the necessary and universal basis of all experiencing and conceptualizing<sup>iii</sup>. The self possesses a priori knowledge of the concept of an object and the process of causation<sup>iv</sup> and reality must conform to those structures of the mind “we can know a priori of things only what we put in them” (Kant 1954 p. 75).

The existence of knowledge thus requires the prior existence of an understanding, reasoning self. The (self) realization of the self is thus the condition of the existence of the world. Moreover this “transcendental” self is not just the source of knowledge. It is the will determining all action and all knowing. In this sense the transcendental self is ‘consciousness in general’. It cannot be known for it is the source and not the object of experience. The recognition of the self requires not knowledge but faith. That is why Kant can claim that his task is “to limit knowledge in order to make room for faith”. But faith in what? In freedom says Kant for freedom is “a postulate of practical reason a pre-supposition of morality”<sup>v</sup>. It is this faith in freedom, which makes it possible to derive the universal moral principle, which defines duty.

Reason tells the individual what his duty is. Morality is merely the free and practical use of reason. Reason defines for man his religion and his morality. Reason gives a morality, which enunciates universalisable principles. These universalisable principles - Kant calls them “moral laws” - are categorical imperatives. The categorical imperative when acted upon produces a harmonious community in which Riffat is always treated as an end in herself. This is Kant’s “Kingdom of Ends”.

The individual is autonomous in that he can unaided discover truth. Morality is merely a relationship between him and the universal laws, which he has discovered by reasoning - the universal law is thus a product of pure practical reason alone. Reason enables the individual to detach his noumenal self from his phenomenal self (desires) and from the phenomenal world. The individual is good in himself because he autonomously discovers the good. But rationality is ultimately grounded on the individual’s “belief in freedom” to which he is intuitively committed. Kantian morality is therefore not a rejection of the instincts and the passions. The space for the instincts as a source of knowledge and therefore morality is



most clearly presented in the Third Critique (1790) where Kant argues that feeling has its own intelligence and ultimate cosmic truths must be felt.

In this conception of the self, the individual is the source of all feeling, knowledge and action; all external reality is incorporated into his mind. The individual's mind constitutes reality and he is responsible for the world being the way it is. The German Romantics - Fichte, Herder and Hegel - insisted that the individual also is a bearer of volksgeist - the spirit of a community. Fichte emphasizes that the individual is a doer - not a mere knower - "in the beginning was the act" wrote Goethe summarizing the essence of Fichte's teaching. It is the individual who is absolute not the world. Spinoza had also argued this - though in a different way - in the seventeenth century. Schelling was to argue that the world was in the individual. In Schelling's conception the individual is a single, multifaceted, self-creating continuously developing cosmos of which nature is one aspect and mind another. Here it is impossible to separate subject from object. God gains consciousness of Himself through the human individual's being and willing<sup>vi</sup>, as he makes of nature what he wills. The human being defines truth he does not just know it.

But the individual is not Hegel's Geist - he is part of a language community, which embodies the self as absolute in a specific history. Such a language community conceives of truth as its own agreement with itself - for there is no "world in itself" validating a universal truth. Every language community is a realization towards universal truth. The individual must submit to 'spirit' which is a shared interpretation of the mutual interdependence and ultimate collective identity of the language community in which the individual participates.

A language community realizes universal truth through a dialectical process - as in Plato so in Hegel (and in Habermas) truth emerges in conversation<sup>vii</sup>. It is self-reflection by a language community, which leads it to the realization of universalisable truth. This leads to a realization of freedom in the world<sup>viii</sup>. Freedom is realized in history often through "the cunning of reason". Spirit is fully realized at the end of history.

Hegel sees every member of his language community as a bearer of Spirit and Syedna Isa (alai his salam) is seen as just a representative figure. This shows that Hegel rejected the concept of autonomy at the level of the individual only to assert it at the level of the language community. The community is autonomous only to the extent to which the individual is effectively enmeshed in a stable network of social relationships. The shared values, feelings and customs which sustain these relationships originate in a culturally and linguistically specific Sittlichkeit. Morality is based not on universal laws of reason autonomously discovered or created by the individual but on the conventions of a language community (which can be universalized). In his Lectures On the Philosophy of History Hegel announces the arrival of

the end of history and identifies nineteenth century Western civilization as the bearer of Geist - its conventions, constitutions and customs constituting indispensable means for the realization of freedom<sup>ix</sup> and therefore requiring universalization.

The West has created a world through such universalization but Schopenhauer argued this is a world dominated not by its Reason but pre - eminently by its Will. This Will is a brutal indifferent force capable of organizing and manifesting itself in time and space. The Will determines everything, though is itself not determined<sup>x</sup>. The Will itself is free but the individual is a slave of his Will (character). He is compelled to obey the dictates of his desires<sup>xi</sup> and love is impossible<sup>xii</sup>. His reason too is a slave of his desires and philosophy teaches him to give up the illusion that life is good or purposeful according to Schopenhauer.

Since the nineteenth century mainstream Western thought has often rejected this Schopenhaurian conception of the impossibility of choice. But it recognizes choice is to be exercised with respect to intrinsically valueless ends. As Kierkegaard insists it is not what the individual chooses that matters but how he chooses. He must choose passionately and personally - Kant would say authentically and autonomously. But there are no rational grounds on which his choice can be defended. He chooses only to satisfy his desires, his subjective truth. Kierkegaard emphasizes the worth of the individual's inner life. The individual is an authentic self alone with his feeling, passionately choosing what he is to become without the aid of reason - there are shades of Wittgenstein in this image. The individual is acutely conscious of the absurdity of the passionate choices he makes<sup>xiii</sup>. There is a dialectic to which the individual inner life is always subject engulfing him in crises and forcing him to make choices between aesthetic and ethical commitment but this dialectic leads only to movement - never to progress<sup>xiv</sup>. The individual can therefore have no conception of what Kierkegaard called the big picture - no plans to change the world. Kierkegaard was scornfully contemptuous of "the public" and regarded the revolutionary upheavals of 1848 as ridiculous and insane.

The young Marx - as Korsch and Lucas<sup>xv</sup> keep on reminding us - like Kierkegaard was also profoundly concerned with the integrity of 'man's soul'. He distinguished this sharply from 'the money soul of capitalism'. His project, like Scheler's was that of situating a whole harmonious person in a whole harmonious social order and to end the individual's isolation above all from his self (Marx 1963). Alienation could be ended once the individual recognized that through a Slave within the capitalist system he had the power to overthrow the Master. The individual would purify himself by putting an end to all mastership and in communist society - not so different from Kant's Kingdom of Ends - he would be "free to choose". Communism returns man to the realm of inherently absurd (no necessary) choices.

From the mid nineteenth century mainstream Western philosophy has focused on the question of the possibility of the individual's freedom. The positivists - Comte, Mach, Frege, Brentano, Wittgenstein - argue that necessary and universal propositions could be derived only from mathematics and logic. The rest was what Frege described as merely contingent and empirical hypotheses of "psychology". Brentano insisted that every act of consciousness must have an object other than itself. We know things not ideas<sup>xvi</sup>. The individual is always concerned about objects; he is not a self-enclosed consciousness concerned only with himself. Nothing exists but concrete, particular objects. Emotions like thought also have objects - values are just objects of consciousness. Brentano (1948) thus bases his ethics on "value feelings" - It is only a short step to the conclusion that emotions like judgments may be correct or incorrect - they may or may not correspond to objects that exist - soon Freud was to tell us what the individuals true "value feelings" are<sup>xvii</sup>. It is also only a short step away in another direction - the individuals true "value feelings" reflected merely the meanings he derived from his participation in a particular history and there are no necessary or universal meanings that unite humanity. Dilthey was uncomfortable with this idea and put his faith in hermeneutics - the systematic interpretation of human experience - which he hoped would allow us to understand the social and cultural meanings that underlie every human experience. This however is not incompatible with relativism as several philosophers have argued.

Do positivism and relativism deny the individuals free agency? Bergson<sup>xviii</sup> thought not, though he believed the individual to be a bearer of 'a vital force' flowing through time. Man is a consciousness of this vital force and of the flow of time as a concrete indivisible process. It is meaningless to conceptualize this process - to separate cause and effect. The individual is choosing continuously (not at a point in space). He acts freely when an act emanates spontaneously from his whole personality<sup>xix</sup>.

Nietzsche<sup>xx</sup> combines a passionate hatred for Enlightenment's universal morality with a passionate love for Enlightenment's objective, i.e. freedom. Truth for the individual is an instrument of survival not a source of abstract objective, impersonal knowledge. Thought cannot be divorced from inclination. The existence of the world is justifiable only on aesthetic grounds. The individual should live his life as a work of art. Nietzsche announces the death of God and argues that man is motivated solely by the will to power. Morality is a servant of this will. Accepting the moral equality of all human beings is to 'level' society to the lowest common denominator in the name of autonomy. According to Nietzsche 'reason is no more than a system of relations between passions and desires' (1968 P387). Instincts alone move the individual and make him perceptive, creative and wise. Philosophy must encourage 'life enhancing' instincts and reject 'slave morality'. Rejecting this morality is rejecting Socratic / Christian teachings about the unreality of this world and the eternity of the hereafter. But Nietzsche does not advocate principles of master morality for he believes in Fate. He teaches the individual to 'love our fate'. Is he (part of) Übermensch Who loves His fate and sees all He has done and is doing as worthwhile and is willing to do it endlessly? "This life with every pain and every joy and every thought and every

sigh...thou must live..... innumerable times" (1974 p270). If not part of Ubermensch - not of "the few" – the individuals self dissolves into nothingness.

Phenomenology reasserts the worth of the self by asserting that truth could be found in consciousness. The individual can discover the world in his own consciousness. Philosophy was to become a science because phenomenology was the examination of the essential structure of consciousness which could lead to the derivation of the universal and necessary truths of experience. Such necessary truths are non empirical and cannot vary from creature to creature or culture to culture - Husserl rejects "psychologism" and "anthropologism" on such grounds. Consciousness is a separate realm of pure meaning - separate both from objects and the causes of an object's appearance in consciousness. This is the separation of the "I" (the transcendental ego) from the "me" - the empirical self which must remain in constant touch with objects. As transcendental Ego the individual has access to 'the things themselves' (zu den Sachen selbst) without presuppositions and philosophical theories. Not only does the truth, reside in the self, the self itself must find it there. The individual consciousness is thus both the source of truth and its discoverer. The subjective turn leads to the discovery of objectivity<sup>xxi</sup>.

But if the "essential structure of the ego" is to be "discovered" what becomes of Free Will? Freud spent his life exploring the relationship between the conscious and the 'unconscious'. The individual's life is a never-ending struggle between the libido ('the urges of the unconscious') and the ego<sup>xxii</sup> - the self is the product of violently conflicting forces. The unconscious is the seat of the sexual traumas, which necessarily dominate the individual's life and could not be understood without psychoanalysis. The individuals inherent impulses are evil and civilization is possible only through the repression of these instincts. But such repression devastates the individual's being and the "pleasure principle" gives way to "the death wish" (the principle of homeostasis<sup>xxiii</sup>) as a consequence of "self denial".

The inability of the rational self to discover or live an ethical life was forcefully reiterated by Wittgenstein. For him - unlike the Viennese positivists he inspired - the "unswayability of metaphysics" was manifest proof of the necessity to transcend rational thought and to find meaning and significance not in knowledge but in faith, a wordless faith which manifests itself in action and character. Knowledge of "faith" is impossible for faith is unswayable and knowledge is that which can be said. Language represents the world but there is no necessity in the world<sup>xxiv</sup> nor any value. Values have to do with the way the world ought to be not the way it is. Values do have necessity and are not accidental, but nothing can be said about them. Ethics exists "outside the world" (1922 6.4211) and belongs to the transcendental. Subject is not in the world but is " the limit of the world" (1922 5.5632). This subject cannot be described or represented<sup>xxv</sup> and "whereof one cannot speak thereof one must be silent".

Later on in life Wittgenstein lost faith in language as a source of knowledge. There exist merely 'language games' reflecting different forms of life. Language acquires meaning in social interaction and cannot be a representation of universal truth, (1967). Self-doubt is Wittgenstein's parting gift to humanity.

This self-doubt is re-enforced by Heidegger. The individual is not an "I think" not even a "consciousness". He is simply 'being in the world' or Dasein "the being through whom we enquire about Being". As Dasein the individual is concerned with the nature of his being and the meaning of his existence<sup>xxvi</sup>. The individual's being in the world is a seamless whole. He is both absence and presence, both what is now not present to us and what presents itself. His knowledge is secondary to his concernedness his involvement in the world. The individual is forever asking the ultimately unanswerable question "who am I?". This is unanswerable because man's boundaries as Dasein are not self evident - he is in the world concerned primarily with being, not knowing, the "who of dasein is not at all the I myself" (1962 p.115). But despite this ambiguity, of identity the individual's experiences are the sole basis for his understanding of the world. He must care about the world and about his self (and not merely know them as a thing). It is only by virtue of self concern that the individual can relate to other daseins and to the world. But self concern does not imply the prior existence of an individuated self - the self we acquire is socially constructed (das Man). It is "the they" who tell him what to do and who to be. The individual must 'take hold of himself', avoid Fallenness ('average everydayness') and choose his existence despite the presence of facticity. He must choose his authentic Existenz.

Taking 'Existenz' seriously is coming to terms with death which das Man never does: no one can die for Riffat - she dies wholly for herself and by herself. Riffat is a 'being unto death' in the profound sense that by having her own death she can become an authentic self. Facing death as one's own is the hallmark of authenticity. But facing death authentically is terrifying and Heidegger is extremely obscure about this aspect of Existenz - he often seems to agree with Schopenhauer and Wittgenstein that in the end we should be silent. Dasein may be the 'ultimate disclosure of meaning' but what meaning is disclosed remains profoundly obscure.

Hermeneutics brings back the search for meaning from death to life. Gadamer argues that Riffat shares with all the world a historical situation which makes possible a comparing of various interpretations. Leading to a fusion of horizons this reawakens a consciousness of solidarity which makes the individual to know himself as essentially part of a humanity that shares the problem of life on earth. Habermas laments that communication and interpretation are systematically distorted by political forces. Modes of interpretation need to be fashioned which can facilitate a truer understanding of our selves in the world. Habermas is convinced of the ultimate possibility of a harmonious universal consensus on interpretation and has faith in Enlightenment values - specially in human reason and in freedom. Recently however

Habermas seems to have abandoned his attempt to justify human rights and the universalist morality derived from this justification. We will return to this point later.

The individual “absolute freedom” is a central tenet of Sartre’s philosophy. There are no necessary choices<sup>xxvii</sup>. With freedom comes responsibility. Consciousness is forever searching for the self which is to be created through living - that is by Riffat’s actions and her relations with other people. Consciousness - in Sartre and Camus and Merleau - Ponty - is not selfish. It is free and rational set against and seeking to know and separate itself from a meaningless, and ‘absurd’<sup>xxviii</sup> physical world. It is part of the individual’s responsibility to put whatever meaning he likes into an indifferent, valueless world. In Camus’ view death frustrates him for it shows the ultimate meaninglessness of his life.

The only unpardonable sin is the rejection of freedom and “success is not important to freedom” (Sartre 1956 p. 591). In this Sartre’s ethics are closely akin to Kant and Rousseau. Several authors have noted the close affinity between Sartre’s and Kant’s ethical thought. But for Sartre “hell is other people” and freedom is “freedom from others” but paradoxically conflict can be overcome only in a group which is fighting to win its independence<sup>xxix</sup>. Seeking freedom in this way can be interpreted as losing subjectivity and finding laws in structures of languages and cultures. Levi - Strauss thought that this is not a rejection of universality for the structures of the human mind could be discovered in culture and languages. The individual simply disappears in structuralism which is a search for the objective laws determining human activity. An analysis of structure does not reveal meaning which remains subjective<sup>xxx</sup>. Foucault’s “archeology” can be interpreted as an extension of Levi Strauss’ structuralism. It is a description of the actual historical permutation of the elements of the Western system of ideas and practices<sup>xxxi</sup>. Foucault argues that as one cannot define an element outside a system it is impossible to formulate a description of all possible permutations of the elements of a system and universal (cross cultural and a temporal) laws regarding such permutations cannot be known. Foucault speaks of “the death of man” in the specific sense that universal meanings cannot be derived. Knowledge is power in Foucault’s system and meanings are socially manufactured. Systemically specific meanings are revealed in the ‘discursive practises’ that depict power relations in a specific social order.

Foucault recognizes the existence of meaning but argues that it should not be taken seriously. He rejects the idea of progress. Foucault’s hyper pessimism depicts the individual alone in the jungles of post modern society filled with revulsion of that society and of himself. But he retains the Kantian faith in freedom (Rizvi 2001) and continues his meaningless struggles against domination while recognizing the inevitability of the dominance of capitalist structures of power. Derrida ridicules these struggles for both God and man are dead and presence is a myth<sup>xxxii</sup>. There are simply no certainties even philosophical language is riddled with contradiction. We can only ‘deconstruct’ meaning and there is “no author of texts” no transcendental subject. Deconstruction is the art of destroying the ‘transcendental signified’ and of showing the historical rootedness of all practical consensus<sup>xxxiii</sup>. Revolution, too of course, is meaningless and Derrida’s is merely an academic denial of God, the self and the world.

Neither Derrida nor Habermas, nor any one else in the Western metaphysical tradition rejects freedom as an ideal and as an aspiration. They are however increasingly unable to justify this commitment to freedom. As noted above until recently justifying the morality of freedom was a central theme in Habermas' work. But in recent writings (Habermas 2001 p113-29), human rights are defended merely as an answer to a problem that once confronted Europeans. Human rights and constitutional democracy are seen as contingent upon the desire of free and equal citizens to self legislate. The existence of free and equal citizens and their desire to self legislate is not justified. Habermas recognizes that the morality of freedom cannot be justified to anyone who would not argue about morality for the process of arguing is itself normatively structured. Validating the commitment to the morality of freedom through participation in discourse requires the prior commitment of the participant to (a) recognize no other normative authority other than that of the argument and (b) to aspire towards a secular framework to articulate their specific interest (Abdel – Noor 2004p.75). In other words only secular cognitivists can be rationally convinced of the justification of constitutional democracy and the morality of freedom. They accept that norms are validated with references to the wills of the participants of the discussion – they cannot be validated with reference to a super rational source or a transcendental authority.

“Argumentation” as understood by Habermas can lead to mutual understanding (Verständigung) only if participants have equal access and equal opportunities of participation. Truth is merely the consensus arrived at among such discourse participants who recognize discourse as the only means for arriving at truth in this consensual manner. The presuppositions of argumentation and the motives of those who participate in the argumentation process are thus interconnected. Motives of participants as well as reason which they accept must be articulated within a particular *Sparchsystem* which necessarily limits the articulation of reason and interests. Habermas assumes that a *Sparchsystem* can be found in which all interests can be expressed and within which universalization can be validated as a criterion of morality and constitutional democracy as the principle of political legitimacy. The democratic principle encodes the idea of both participation and individual rights (i.e. public and private autonomy). It is simultaneous provision of public and private autonomy which characterizes constitutional democracy.

The presupposition of the equal access and equal participation of all members of a *Sparchsystem* is required for the rational justification of constitutional democracy. If some members (prophets, aulia and ulema for example) have privilege of access constitutional democracy cannot be justified on Habermasian grounds. It is only within argumentation as conceived by Habermas that rejection of constitutional democracy and the universalization principle is a logical impossibility. If the presuppositions of argumentation are rejected there are no grounds for the rational justification of either universalisability or constitutional democracy. We have seen that these presuppositions commit the participants in argumentation to secular cognitivism. Muslims and others who reject secular cognitivism can only endorse constitutional democracy if they “bracket” the metaphysical and ethical

world view which they espouse. In a constitutional democratic regime Muslims are expected to give minimal importance to the Islamic beliefs and practices which contradict the presuppositions underlying universalism and constitutional democracy. The “needs” and “interests” a Muslim pursues within constitutional democratic order cannot emanate from his commitment to Islamic moral and political practices – these practices must be subordinated to constitutional democracy. Neither Habermas nor Rawls offer any argument justifying this “bracketing and trivialization of the Muslims comprehensive doctrines. Moreover the Muslim must be prepared to modify / abandon his moral and political doctrines in a process of argumentation with other secular cognitivists. Habermas does not demonstrate the necessity of accepting his conception of argumentation with its implied pre suppositions as the only (rather than the Euro centric specific) form of communication in society. Neither Habermas nor his apologists (e.g. William Rehg 1994) can present a reason for the view that norms must emerge from argumentation or social communication or conflicts regarding norms ought to be resolved through argumentation (as conceived by Habermas).

There is no justification for assuming the universality of secular cognitivism. This illustrates the fact that the advocates of constitutional democracy – the advocates of modernity – presume a particular subjectivity (Touraine 1995). This presupposed subjectivity is inherently and essentially anti religious. It celebrates its “liberation” from an all encompassing holistic order. It celebrates its autonomy and its right to pursue its ends: without reference to religious prescriptions of any kind. The modern / post modern subject is forced to take up the God like position of a transcendental nodal point. This transcendental pretense is of course bogus, Habermas is forced to confess “the principle of subjectivity is not powerful enough to regenerate the unifying power of religion in the medium of reason... The demotion of religion leads to a split (in the subject), which the Enlightenment cannot overcome by its own power” (1987 p20). The “liberated” subject frantically seeks meaning, re embeddedness, identity. The modern subject seeks a distancing from “everydayness” through the psuedo transcendence bestowed on him by the modern constructs of nature and culture. Identity (individual and collective) is sought in cultural constructs such as nation and class. But identity is always purchased at the cost of autonomy. Modern subjectivity is always torn between the promise of liberation and the threat of alienation. Schizophrenia is written into the formative phase of the modern self.

The main sources of capitalist identity consciousness – family, class and nation – are in relentless decline throughout the Western world. The market is inexorably colonizing, every segment of society and all relations are being commodified. Genetic engineering and communication technology seek to reconstruct nature and culture in the service of the market. The foundations grounding modern identity are being eroded. Perceptive observers such as Cornelia Klinger have recognized that this has created a “neither nor” situation for modern man “Neither can we hope to compensate for the loss of certainty and solidarity in a quest for new foundations, nor can we celebrate the freedom that we will win” (2004 p131). The market dissolves modern subjectivity by submerging the subject in the ocean of consumption. The market replaces, God, the family, the nation, the class. The modern subject “shops for his real self”. The modern self is defined by and dependent upon pre fabricated goods. The freedom he



enjoys is merely choosing one good rather than another. Stepping outside the market is not a possibility for the market has now colonized all aspects of individual and social existence “eroding the distance between commodified and non commodified regions... hyper commodification (leads) to the commodification of meaning” (Cook et al 1992 p74). Capitalism is now both culture and reason, both subjectivity and objectivity. There is in modern individuality and modern society no “outside’ of capitalism (Tourainne 1995 p64).

In capitalism “the subject is trapped in an obsession with identity and reason is merely an instrument of might” (Tourainne 1995 p66). Narcissitic individualism takes the place of social consciousness and there is a complete divorce between public and private life. This leads to “the triumph of powers defined purely in terms of management and strategy. The majority retreat to a private space leav(ing) a bottomless void... where there was once the political space... that gave birth to democracy” (Tourainne 1995 p150). Ideas of a common good and of a universal community appear ridiculous in such a setting.

But paradoxically the liberation from foundations (religion, tradition, nation, class) makes resistance to the capitalist markets almost impossible. No vantage point is available to modern / post modern man for critiquing capitalist totality. Capitalism colonizes the self. The individual is devoid of inwardness and depth. “The managed possession of consumer goods is atomizing and de-historicizing. The consumer item isolates and the consumer is solitary” (Baudrillard 1998 p75). Modernity based on pure individual self interest leaves the subject without any solidarity, without any binding collective culture. He is adrift on the tides of momentary desires vulnerable to complete subordination to market forces. The capitalist economy is hegemonic. It dissolves subjectivity – as structuralism recognizes – through the confinement of choice in consumer and financial markets.

Enlightenment philosophy serves capitalism by creating the myth of a quasi transcendental subject – a subject who seeks transcendence in the world – liberated from tradition and religion, autonomous bearer of rights, subject of capital (economic man). This subject was supposed to be sovereign as citizen and as consumer. Autonomy and secular identity (in the form of nation or class) implied the possibility of at least a theoretical distancing of freedom from the order of capital. This illusion must now be abandoned as the collapse of the socialist regimes illustrates. The market subsumes the state and the decisions of the citizen cannot contradict the logic of capital. There is literally no transcendental pretense in modern capitalist order as Habermas’ inability to justify universalization and constitutional democracy shows. In this insane world the only rationality which survives is market rationality, the rationality of consumption and of accumulation for its own sake. As Klinger notes “this attempt to turn means into meaning is paradoxical and will remain futile in the long run. This fact may however be effectively hidden from view since the hunger for meaning is easily duped and constantly deferred by the supply of ever new mean” (2004 p135-136).

Capital has subjectified human being through liberating it from God and from submission to His will. Transcending capitalism necessitates a rejection of liberation and an assertion of man's status as Abd Allah (the slave of God). Liberation / freedom is to be rejected within the market society and the state. We now turn to an analysis of the market.

---

***Summary: Capitalist Individuality***

- Is capitalism / democracy universal and necessary?
- This claim founded on the Enlightenment's conception of rationality – ontological truth can be discovered through deductive / inductive logical processes.
- This reason is universal – common to all human beings as is the pursuit of this worldly happiness. Reason is therefore a slave of this passion for pleasure.
- Reason identifies the universal moral norms and social practises, which can maximize human happiness.
- Since every one is rational every one must rationally choose (a) maximization of happiness as the purpose of life (b) the norms and practises which makes this possible autonomously – no domination.
- In Romanticism intuitions / passion are seen as the source of ontological truths.
- The self – the source of intuitions – is necessarily good (for it can discover truth). It is good even when it wills evil (for this is just a means for achieving good). That is why the Roussiuan General Will is always good – willing the welfare of all. This is the basis of the faith in democracy and (autonomous) capitalist contracts.
- According to Kant the self “does not derive its laws from but prescribes them to nature”. It possesses an order which determines the structure of our experiences. The self gives the world its form and meaning. The self is transcendental in the sense that it is the necessary universal basis of all experiencing and conceptualizing. It has prior knowledge of the concept of an object and of the process of causation.
- As the self is the source of experiencing and knowledge it cannot be known. We have faith in it – in a self which is free to know and to will the world autonomously. This freedom is the presupposition of democratic / capitalist immorality.

- It is reason which tells us what our duty is. Reason produces universalizable moral principles. The practise of these universalizable principles produces a harmonious community (“a kingdom of ends”) in which everyone is treated as an end in himself.
- Reason permits a detachment of the noumenal self from the phenomenal self and the phenomenal world. The self is essentially good because it can autonomously discover the good. Faith in freedom is required for this discovery. Faith in freedom is intuitive.
- The self is the source of all feeling, knowledge and action and it is responsible for the world. In the German Romanticist tradition the self is seen as creating the world – willing truth not just knowing it.
- Hegel expands the self from the individual to a language community. Hegel also denies the existence of self validating universal truth. Every language community creates its own universal truth which is a shared interpretation of the collective experiences of a language community. The self realization of a language community takes place in history. The self realization of the West is the end of history.
- It is not the individual but the language community which is autonomous. Morality is the conventions / way of life of a community – it is not universal laws created / discovered by autonomous individuals – at the end of history the West’s conventions / constitutions are indispensable for freedom.
- Schopenhauer showed that the world that the West has created is dominated by its Will not by its Reason. The Will is free – and reason is its slave. From the 19<sup>th</sup> Century the West insists upon the possibility of choice – but choice only among valueless ends. Kierkegaard argues it is not important what you choose but how you chose it. Choices cannot be defended rationally. All choices are ultimately absurd and passionate commitment does not lead to moral progress. Life is full of crises of choosing between equally absurd commitments.
- Marx saw this as alienation and believed that it could be avoided by situating the whole harmonious person in a whole harmonious society. Class struggle was the means for creating a harmonious society and would lead to Communist Society where choice would be unlimited. Absurdity returns.
- Since the late 19<sup>th</sup> century the West asks, is Freedom possible. The positivists – Comte, Wittgenstein, Frege – reject the possibility of answering the main ontological questions rationally – necessary and universalizable propositions are only logical / mathematical other investigations of ontological questions were mere “psychologism”.
- Emotions and judgements are correct if they reflect the individual’s true “value feelings”. Thus Dilthey argued that these may reflect historical experience but hermeneutics – the systematic interpretation of human experience – may allow us to understand the meaning of every human experience. Nevertheless relativism could not be ruled out.

- Nietzsche – and Bergson – react to relativism by seeing the individual as the bearer of a vital force – the will to survive. Truth is an instrument for survival, not a source of knowledge. The morality of *ubermensch* is spending life as a work of art – a rejection of slave morality and an acceptance of fate.
- Phenomenology sought to return to universals by asserting that truth could be found in consciousness. Examining the structure of consciousness could reveal the universal / necessary truths of experience. The transcendental self “I” must find the truth in itself. Turning inwards leads the individual to objective truth (Husserl).
- Freud argued that objective truth is to be discovered essentially in the sub conscious. The urges of the unconscious (‘the libido’) dominate the individual’s life. But these urges are evil and civilization is possible only through their repression, this repression, “self denial”, leads to the “death wish”.
- Wittgenstein asserts the impossibility of discovering the ethical life through reason. Metaphysics is unsayable. There was therefore a need to transcend rational discourse. There is no necessity or value in the world. Knowledge is not to be found even in language – there are only “language games” which cannot represent universal truth. Wittgenstein gives us self doubt.
- Self doubt is re-enforced by Heidegger. The individual is merely *Dasein* – “being in the world” enquiring about Being. Asking the unanswerable question “who am I”. The boundaries of the self are unclear. The individual is concerned primarily with being not knowing. The self is partly constructed by “the they”. The self must choose his *Existenz* and avoid *Falleness*. Choosing *Existenz* seriously is coming to terms with death. Facing death is the hallmark of authenticity. But how this is to be done and what meaning is revealed by being remains unclear in Heidegger.
- Gadamer and Habermas argue that meaning is to be found in life not in death – the self knows itself as part of a humanity that shares the problem of life on earth. Intersubjective communication – if not distorted politically – can lead to a harmonious consensual universal fusion of interpretations that asserts Enlightenment values. Since the mid 1990s Habermas has significantly qualified these claims about the universality of human rights.
- Sartre endorses the absolute freedom of the individual – there are no necessary choices. The self is to be created. It is itself nothing. Consciousness can make the world what it is not. It can put whatever meaning it likes into the world attempting to do this is wanting to be God. Abandoning this wish is bad faith but in Camus’ view death frustrates this wish and shows the ultimate meaninglessness of life.
- Structuralism argues that objective laws of human behavior – though not meaning – can be discovered in the structure of culture and language. Foucault seeks to study the structure of Western civilization and identifies the historical sources (the genealogy) of these structures. He denies the possibility of deriving universal laws of human behavior from this examination. He speaks of the death of man in the precise sense that universal meanings cannot be derived. Knowledge is socially manufactured and discursive practices reveal power relations in a specific social setting. In Foucault meaning is not truth. Progress is impossible. The individual is filled with revulsion of post-modern

society but continues the meaningless struggle for freedom despite recognizing the inevitability of capitalist subjectivity.

- Derida ridicules these struggles. There is no meaning, no subject, no reality. All practical consensus is historically constructed. We can merely deconstruct.

## 2.2. The Market

The subject of capital seeks freedom primarily in the market. The quest for freedom, capitalism, destroys the subject's private life - it provides no grounds for ordering felt wants and desires and these can only be concatenated not ordered - capitalism is an immoral order which trivializes all ends except accumulation which is a means for any (and therefore no) end. Non market (family and friendship) relationships are thus left ungrounded and their gradual disappearance from capitalist society mirrors the impossibility of love for love is essentially the negation of freedom.

The subject of capital thus cannot answer the question: what is the good life for he pursues the evil, freedom, in his association with all men. Walzer (1972) is simply wrong to advocate separation of "spheres of justice" and warn against the domination of one sphere over another. He himself recognizes that the market is a sphere without boundaries - for "money is insidious (it) is like a totalitarian state dominating every other distributive process... transform(ing) every social good into a commodity" (pp.119-120). The recognition of the inevitability of market dominance - and the associated disappearance of morality and the subject's privateness - led Hegel to speak of civil society in which individualistic, contractual relations of exchange are buttressed by welfarism and the strengthening of 'corporations'<sup>xxxiv</sup> and no arrangements are seen as necessary for safeguarding family life from the encroachment of individualist contracts<sup>xxxv</sup>. Indeed the separation and gradual elimination, of private and public spheres - and the gradual, systematic destruction of the subject's morality and his private life, is a consequence of the rise of the market as the primary source and form of economic organization.

Although the subject is not bought and sold in the market his life practices are commodified, commodification of the subject's life practices involves:

- (a) The subject's own valuation of these practices as means for satisfying any desires he may happen to have (i.e. as means for expanding his freedom) rather than in terms of their intrinsic value.
- (b) Other people's valuation of these practices and of the subject as a means for promoting their freedom / desires – the subject of course has no moral worth in such a system of valuation.
- (c) Both the subject and other people regard products of all practices as exchangeable. They are rendered equivalent through the universalisable medium of exchange - capitalist money – which assumes the concrete form of freedom in the circuit of accumulation.

Civil society is the sphere of the market in the profound sense that the individual's, practises and products which are not bought or sold are methodically subjected to commodification, subjected that is to valuation in terms of their contribution to the satisfaction of preferences (enhancement of freedom) which themselves require no moral justification<sup>xxxvi</sup>. The traditional Islamic bazaar is an arena for the expression of values assigned to practices when the individual is capable of ordering his wants on the basis of Allah's command and when Islamic society sanctions these practises. The bazaar is marketised as wants are concatenated, morality is abandoned and valuation is determined in terms of the relative contribution of practises to the promotion of freedom (accumulation of capital). When marketised the bazaar necessarily subsumes civil society in the profound sense that all of the subject's practises are subjected to commodification. The market forces the subject to order his wants in accordance with the single permanent universal criterion of capital, accumulation (the concrete form of freedom). Since satisfaction of wants depends primarily on access to capital practices which obstruct the capital accumulation process are assigned negative value and the worth of all practices and all practitioners is determined strictly in accordance with their contribution to capital accumulation. Since there are no other operationalizable criteria for valuation in civil society MacIntyre's internal goods (such as the aesthetic appeal of art or of scientific theory) are necessarily decomposed and subjected to the capitalist valuation processes. Neither MacIntyre nor any one else can identify any alternative valuation criteria or any insurmountable hurdles restricting the universalisability of capital valuation criteria in civil society. Preventing the Islamic bazaar's marketization is necessary for resisting the commodification of the individuals being.

Isolating practice spheres from market valuation within capitalist society is not feasible because - as Wittgenstein recognized - values cannot be produced in this world. What the market produces is an absence of value, not an alternative to the value assigned to practises by Allah. Valuing practices in terms of their contribution to capital accumulation (freedom) is not valuing them in an absolute sense - for freedom has no value, no substantive content. It is a mere nothingness.

The market produces preferences for prioritizing capital accumulation and its associated practises. It is not just that it ignores the "internal goods" of non-accumulation practices. It's operation systematically colonizes all non accumulative practises and permeates them with the logic of capital. Contrary to MacIntyre's conceptualization there is no room for "external" goods since the bazaar's marketisation by its nature is a totalizing evil.

Marketising the bazaar is establishing the global hegemony of capital. Capitalist markets invariably emerge from non-capitalist social orders and they are deliberate creations of a capitalist state or of their agencies - the World Trade Organization is presently constructing a global technology market by

universalising the US patent system. The creators of capitalist property and of capitalist markets are motivated by the accumulating ethos<sup>xxxvii</sup>. Marketising the bazaar requires the prior legitimization of the capitalist property form. This legitimising of capitalist property requires both the production of a new ideology<sup>xxxviii</sup> and the exercise of political power by those who espouse this ideology.

The continued social dominance of the market requires that power be transferred to those who can best organize production and exchange systems for maximizing capital accumulation not just in the market but in politics, culture, scientific research and religion. This requires a universalization of the wage form - once again not just in the market but throughout society. The universalization of the wage form involves the necessary “withering away” of private property. Capitalist property is not private because it is dedicated to accumulation. Control of this property is vested in individuals who possess the skills and knowledge for efficient accumulation. They manage capitalist property on behalf of its formal “owners” and rewards to both “owners” and managers correspond to relative success achieved in capital accumulation. Both operatives and managers are waged - they constitute the overwhelming majority of a capitalist country’s labour force - and the ability of non-waged “owners” to accumulate efficiently depends crucially on the performance of the waged operatives and managers. Labour is the starting point of capital in the specific sense that universalising of the wage form is a pre - requisite for the social dominance of capital accumulation. As Mesazoras writes “(E)ven the richest capitalists, no matter how many shares they own... must obey the objective imperatives of the system ... or suffer the consequence and go out of business ... their power of control within the framework of the capital system is quite negligible “(1995 pp. 41-42)”.

This withering away of private ownership should not obscure the fact that the continued social dominance of markets requires their regulation. Regulation is typically undertaken both by “private” market agents - firms and banks - and by public agencies - ministries, courts, intergovernmental bodies. Forms of market regulation are historically and culturally specific and that is why we can speak of the (co) existence of different variants of capitalism - German, Anglo Saxon, merchant, industrial etc. We can also speak of a transition from one capitalist regime of accumulation to another or of a transition from a capitalist to a non-capitalist property form. It is the duty of the capitalist state<sup>xxxix</sup> to delegitimise and obstruct a transition from capitalist to non-capitalist property regimes and facilitate a transition from a non-capitalist to a capitalist formation.

Establishing the hegemony of capitalist markets requires the universalization of the vices of avarice and covetousness. The pursuit of freedom not the practice of virtue is to be regarded as the purpose of individual and social life. As Polyani says ““instead of the economy being embedded in social relations, social relations are embedded in the economic system... society is run as an adjunct to the market “(1949 p. 57). For such a social system to be regarded as legitimate there must be a forgetfulness of death and

of being and an acceptance of the doctrine of the eternity of the world in which the subject of capital shares through capital accumulation. The subject must also accept the income and power distributional inequalization of capitalist order as not transcendable and have faith in capitals' ability to expand the realm of freedom<sup>xi</sup>.

Sustaining faith in these premises requires the regulation of both the market and the state<sup>xli</sup>. Actually existing capitalism is characterized by both coherence and heterogeneity – the subject's behaviour is often irrational and practises and structures in the market are also sometimes non-optimising. Capitalist rationality has to be made dominant by regimes of regulation which structure the behaviour of individuals and groups with asymmetric access to information and other resources and possessing heterogeneous values. The regulation regimes smooth out the distortions created by a particular process of accumulation. Accumulation is the process whereby money / power is concentrated in the hands of those who manage capital and freedom takes the form of capital - freedom is essentially the freedom to accumulate. Retaining faith in freedom requires establishing the universal dominance of finance - for accumulation has finite physical limits. Infinite accumulation can occur only in financial markets. In financial markets alone can the vices of avarice and covetousness find infinite, limitless, eternal and universal expression.

Commodity and labour markets must therefore be subjected to the dominance of the financial markets. The movement of money capital (finance) must determine the division of labour, structure the employer - employee relationship and dominate the "private"<sup>xlii</sup> and public life of both "capitalists" and "labourers". Finance dominates commodity and labour markets in the specific sense that it values all practises and products of these markets in terms of their relative contribution to accumulation. Private property must be destroyed and property must be corporatised so that death is transformed into bankruptcy and the hereafter is conceived as infinite, limitless accumulation.

Capitalist order must thus entail

- (a) Universalising dominance of the desire to accumulate
- (b) Continued expectation of the possibility of accumulation.
- (c) Continued domination of financial markets
- (d) Continued management of financial claims and obligations to avoid systemic crises.

A crisis - the mismatching of claims and obligations - is an ever-present possibility in financial markets. Accumulation necessitates the systematic taking of risks to realize value. Investment flows to



corporations, which are expected to be efficient accumulators, but the market has no mechanisms to ensure that its expectations are right. Accumulation takes the forms of equity and bond stocks, which can become valueless and debt, which can be repudiated. Ultimately the market possesses no knowledge for ascertaining accumulative value potential. It's valuation assessments are arbitrary based on caprices, prejudices and mathematical models. These valuations are no more than speculations about the future and the future is a closed book for capitalist social sciences<sup>xliii</sup>. This illustrates the point that capitalist value ordering is not spontaneously or naturally generated either in the market or in the subject's consciousness, nor is it self-perpetuating. All markets can be demarketised and the individual can reject capitalist immorality. Making this impossible is the task of policy makers in the market, in the state and at the global level<sup>xliv</sup>.

In the capitalist market the principal policy maker is the corporation. It structures rules of payments, flows of goods and financial relationships into a hierarchy relating stake holders with claims and obligations on the values produced in the market. The corporation legitimises this structuring on the basis of a specific internal political practise, which defines it as a capitalist (and not an Islamic) business. Intra corporate political practice delegitimises the pursuit of freedom at the workplace and legitimates the subordination of non-managers to managers for the pursuit of freedom (accumulation) in the market.

Loss of this right to pursue freedom within the corporation has to be compensated elsewhere for in order to retain his personal immoral commitment to accumulation the subject must personally accumulate money / power. In the "Fordist" regime of accumulation (roughly 1933 - 1980 in Britain and America) subordination at the level of the workplace was legitimised by the provision of collective rights, "labour" interests were integrated in markets by recognizing the collective political rights of non capitalists to negotiate the terms of the employment contract and their share of added value produced in the market. This involved restrictions on the movement and the accumulation of capital and on the mobility of labour within corporations. More importantly it created new personal identities - trade unionist, professional, manager - which displaced traditional identities - Christian, Irishman, mother - and served to provide social foundations to capitalist order. The consolidation of these new identities requires the individuals continued commitment to consumerism and his belief that access to freedom depends on collective action taken by groups that effectively represent his class interests.

"Fordism" was undermined by the inexorable atomization of communities - Fordism's basic collectivity, that of labour, proved to be far more fragile than the religious and national collectivities it had partially supplanted. It endorsed the politics of globalization and relinquished its hold on the levers of market and state power "not with a bang but a whimper". It accepted a revision of the employment contract and widening income and wealth distributional disparities. The "post Fordist" order saw a massive growth in the social and political power of the market and the virtual disappearance of restrictions on the movement and the accumulation of capital.

But “post Fordism” is also not a self-sustaining order. It needs regulation. So human resource management has taken the place of collective bargaining at the level of the corporation and a “market friendly” or “market creating” state willing to underwrite the risks and reduce the costs of the corporation has emerged from the ruins of social democracy and its welfarist political regime. (Chomsky 1998).

Disorganization of labour is a key feature of the “post Fordist” regime of accumulation. This is a necessary consequence of the increased concentration and centralization of capital and the enhanced dominance of financial markets within capitalist social formations. The mediation processes through which this disorganization of labour is achieved operate at several levels - enterprise, market, culture, state and global. Here we will examine the causes of the disorganization of labour at the enterprise and market levels only. The proliferation of the new management techniques has two major systemic causes.

First, the democratic state now plays an increasingly important role in prioritizing capital’s interest within the social formation. Anti union legislation restricting collective rights has been common throughout the Anglo Saxon world (and in many Latin American and Asian countries) during the last two decades. Legislation restricts strike action and legitimises no strike deals. Strict strike balloting procedures are instituted and unions are heavily penalized for violation. Unofficial action is effectively outlawed and secret balloting has replaced mass meeting decisions in most countries<sup>xlv</sup>.

Thus, it is the state, which provides democratic legitimacy for the empowerment of management at the work place. Management uses the new legal resources placed at its disposal to the full - legalism replaces negotiation as a key feature of the new industrial relations system.

Secondly, the new found strength of the HR manager is based upon the growth of existing and potential unemployment and specially the breakdown of the tenured full time job contract. Job insecurity is a threat to all workers but new recruits and specially the young can be easily alienated from shop floor labour practices. Such workers are typically more influenced by market conditions - Dunford speaks of a “customization” of the working class (1998). Contract and other non-tenured workers are more easily “responsibilised” in the sense that they are made conscious of the need to continuously meet customer expectations. Buyers - specially large buyers, now regularly intervene in the production process to ensure quality, risk free supplies and price structure commitments. Often customers participate directly in strike breaking and threats to withdraw orders is now normal customer practice for disciplining workers. Work teams are made directly responsible to corporate customers and individual workers

develop a sense of accountability to customers. Participative TQM ideology is often a mask for customer hegemony at the shop floor level. The customer effectively joins the supervising staff in the low trust strictly disciplined organizational structure of team production.

In theory, TQM and team working are expected to encourage co-operative working attitudes at the shop floor level and generate an atmosphere of high trust. In practice they produce fear, stress and insecurity and therefore undermine trust (Thompson and Ackroyd 1998). The new industrial relations are premised on a systematic suppression of rank and file organization and a rejection of the collective rights entailed in Fordist commitment to full employment and wage determination through collective bargaining. The breakdown of Fordism as a social accumulation regime is a major proximate cause of the disorganization of labour.

Reducing full time employment is an explicit objective of the institutionalization of lean production as is the dissolution of collective bargaining processes through the enactment of multiple year wage negotiation periods. Lean production is a means for the intensification of work - it requires a more aggressive, more demanding management style but this is not typically accompanied by an enhancement of training or an improvement of the work environment. The institutionalization of the new, HRM techniques depends crucially upon a de-politicisation of labour. Ultimately the disorganization of the work force in the major capitalist countries (and in Latin America, South and East Asia) is explained by its political demoralization and the failure of its traditional political parties to articulate coherent macroeconomic strategies premised on a reassertion of collective (as against human) rights. Several authors (Gall 1998, Fairbrother 1996) have argued that there are no binding technological constraints restricting the re organization of labour at the workplace or systemically.

Post Fordism has often shifted power and work process control from one group of workers to another not to managers. Gall (1998) documents this shift in the case of the British newspaper industry. He shows how changes in technology shifted power from one group of workers - compositors - to another - journalists. The introduction of new technology does not itself lead to labour disorganization - managers deliberately mould technology adoption processes to achieve this end. Introduction of new technology also often involves the abolition of the closed shop and the introduction of no strike deals but many groups of highly organized workers have shown that such work process changes can be contested. Newly empowered skilled workers can seize control of the technology and impose a heavy cost on management through an adroit use of go slow and work to rule practices. Similarly, there is no reason why quality circles (QCs) should be accepted as union substitutes, workers - specially skilled workers - can successfully resist. HRM initiatives aimed at their individuation. But this can occur only if unions actively resist incorporation and de-politicisation of work organization processes. Fairbrother lists a series of "preconditions" for union revival in the post Fordist work environment. These are (a) high

leadership turnover (b) high level of membership participation in union affairs (c) stress on membership education (both technological and political) and (d) avoidance of sectarianism. Management sponsored forms of representation may be skillfully used alongside traditional collective bargaining if these pre-requisites are met.

Both Thompson and Ackroyd (1998) and Fairbrother (1994) stress that as the new technology increases the pressure on management to raise profits and continuously meet rising debt obligations, new opportunities are created for workplace unionism. Labour skill and competence requirements are rising inexorably. The production process is often a fragile one and a small group of strategically placed workers can do a lot of damage quickly - moreover as intellectual property becomes privatized technology becomes more and more firm specific and firing skilled labour becomes prohibitively expensive.

The central lesson seems to be that the balance of power at the work place is constructed politically not technologically. It is the politics of HRM that need to be challenged for contesting labour disorganization. In other words, union revivalism at the work place must involve an explicit rejection of the liberal democratic premises of HRM. But the workplace is often an inadequate place for fully articulating such a rejection and it must involve the linking of workplace organization to national political forces - worker confidence at the shop floor cannot be built up or sustained in a political environment characterized by apathy, defeatism and atomization where traditional parties of labour are continuing to increase their commitment to capitalism.

Labour reorganization at the workplace, in the market and in the state is restricted not by technological factors but the universality of capitalist immorality. This is the immorality of human rights, which asserts the individual's autonomy and his equal right to freedom. At the turn of the twenty first century, this immorality has become universally dominant in the West, in the sense that a coherent challenge to its dominance is not on the agenda in any major Western country at least for the foreseeable future.

Human rights dominated orders necessarily dissolve collectivities and reconstitute them with in the single dominant category, capital. This process which began in Europe in the seventeenth century with the dissolution of Christian social and political order continues today in the form of the gradual dissolution of the collectivities, which sought to replace Christian hierarchies. The defeat of the Puritans, the Nazis and the Communists and the disintegration of the welfare state may be interpreted as defining moments in the universalization of human rights based immorality.

The dissolution of the collectivity which sustained the welfare state (Fordism) is more problematic for human rights immorality than the dissolution of Christian or nationalist collectivities. This is because

Fordism was a moment in the systemic organization and universalization of human rights discourse - as Christianity, nationalism and communism were not. Indeed the collective rights asserted by labour were premised on human rights and social democrat thinkers such as Keynes and Beveridge (and now Habermas and Rorty) saw them as essential for making labour a subject of capital (Kay and Mott 1982 pp. 137 -156). Human rights are the formal recognition of the sovereignty of the citizen - his divine right to participate in the definition of the good - but the actual exercise of this sovereignty is constrained when the vast majority of individual citizens lack the recourses and the capabilities for this purpose. The constitution of labour into a collectivity - through trade unions and political parties - was a means to overcome this constraint. Labour's collective rights were means for enabling the individual to become a citizen - a subject of capital. Even in the Fordist era however the constitution of a collective subject restricted the universalization of human rights. Nozick (1981) and Hayek (1988) have documented this at great length. The near universal commitment to individual freedom has ensured an increase in the concentration and the centralization of capital. This led to a transcendence of collective subjectivity and its associated collective rights through:

- The growth of consumerism and what used to be called "high mass consumption". The middle class became a quantitative majority in mature capitalist order. As conditions for access to resources were uniformised, commitment to capitalist rationality became the primary determinant of success. Economic mobility within mature capitalist societies increased and social exclusion was confined to those who were unwilling to or incapable of internalising capitalist values and rationalities.
  - The disappearance of ownership in any meaningful sense as far as investment and financing of capital expenditure is concerned.
  - The systemic dominance of financial markets. Manufacturing is a declining source of GDP in all mature capitalist economies and less than ten percent of transactions on the international exchanges have anything to do with the financing of physical investment and trade - 90 percent of these transactions are purely speculative (Hirst and Thompson 1997).
- × The decline in the sovereignty of the nation states which has taken three forms;
  - × An increase in the political power of globalising capital within the nation state - this is specially the case in America.
  - × The emergence of super state political authorities and regional authoritative institutions in the European Union;
  - × An expansion in the mandate and scope of operation of multilateral agencies such as the International Monetary Fund and the World Trade Organization.

The dominance of global capital at the national level, emergence of super state authorities and the empowering of multilateral agencies have all contributed to a shift away from collective rights. This is most clearly evident in Europe where the emergence of the common currency is correctly seen as a means for dismantling the national bargaining structures, which determine wage levels in France, Germany and Italy (Habermas 2001).

The reassertion of collective rights seems unlikely because of the increase in the concentration and centralization of capital, the systemic domination of financial markets, the erosion of national sovereignty and the growth of consumerism. These trends emanate from the logic of capital itself - they are necessary for its continued "universal permanence" in a Hegelian sense. The assertion of collective rights was a phase in capitalist history - the phase of the construction of industrial, national capital. That phase has been transcended and the dominant form of capital is now financial / global not industrial / national. A reversion to the former phase ("Fordism") will necessarily constrain efficient accumulation - accumulation which maximizes profit by enhanced financial mediation of exchange value produced on the basis of a continuously relatively narrowing commodity base. Such efficient accumulation can be constrained by crisis by labour unrest and by nationalist governments. But if the universal, permanence of capitalist order is to be maintained efficient accumulation must prevail - both logically and "in the long run".

Collective rights are premised on human rights and on them alone (Kay and Mott 1982). Human rights are merely the obverse of the duty to accumulate capital - that is why human rights discourse (in for example Locke or Montesque or even Hegel) is grounded on a defense of capitalist property. Collective rights serve the purpose of initiating the transformation of the subject of God into the subject of capital. But this was an unsatisfactory transformation in that the new subjectivity maintained an (at least potentially) antagonistic autonomy. Collective rights ensured access to Rawls' primary goods - income, wealth, power, authority - which were beyond the reach of the individuals who though endowed with formal human rights were still members of the proletariat. As capital accumulates and centralizes, access to power / authority become somewhat irrelevant - hence declining voter turnouts in OECD country elections (Dahrendorf 1996) - and access to income and wealth increases. The rationale for the continued existence of labour as a collective subject is weakened and the universalization of the wage form (in particular) leads to a collapse of labour into capital. The accumulation of capital becomes the purpose of being and the atomised individual becomes a direct, immediate, subject of universal, permanent capital.

Post Fordist capital is of course not universal permanent and like all historical phenomenon it will pass away. But social democracy cannot today be a means for capitalism's death or for its survival. Post

Fordist capitalism's essential systemic weaknesses are (a) the atomisation of the individual and the disintegration of communities (b) a growing disjuncture between the organization of production and finance (both global) on the one hand and of political governance (national and sub-national) on the other (c) the exclusion of a rising mass of unemployable individuals from the immediate circuit of accumulation. These weaknesses have created great anxiety and despair reflected for e.g. in modern American literature. A widely popular novel Snow Crash by Neil Stephenson speaks of a twenty first century America parceled out among private corporations in which national government has lost relevance - government is merely a corporate entity running its own little enclave. Citizenship has died American shores are threatened by invaders from "the Raft" - floating hulks inhabited by millions of Asians hoping to swim to America. The Raft is a vast international slum ruled by criminal gangs. The central message of Snow Crash and of countless other works popular today is that democracy is a farce and government is merely an agent for giant corporations. This vision of what Hobsbawm describes as "the collapse of citizenship" has roots in post modernist philosophies - such as those of Foucault and Heidegger. Post modernism however preaches resignation not resistance (Jameson 1992) - resignation to the ghastly reality of the violent, inhuman, corrupt society that is contemporary America.

Social democratic pleas for a return to Fordism (Habermas 1999, Rorty 1998) are misconceived in the sense that Fordist collective rights were means for enabling ordinary citizens to access resources essential for the practice of human rights. Such resources can be accessed relatively easily in the developed countries today despite the growth of unemployment and income inequalities. The resignation, hopelessness, apathy and dread which manifest themselves in a withdrawal from citizenship in America is a reflection of a widespread disillusionment with the Enlightenment ideals of individual autonomy and freedom as the objective of political order. The social democrat project has succeeded in that through the construction of collective rights, human rights practice has been universalised in the West. But there is decreasing space for the existence of any collectivist subjectivity - communitarian, occupational, religious, national - in post Fordist, capitalist order. The individual is a direct, immediate, universal, permanent subject of capital. He finds this to be a horrific, nauseating and dreadful situation. But escape from this subjection to capital cannot be achieved by the construction of a subjectivity premised on Enlightenment discourse and concerned with the universal practice of human rights. It is this practice, which has created the wasteland that Heidegger and Foucault and Luhmann describe. Those withdrawing from citizenship reject the subjectivity of capital. They seek to break the golden chains of freedom.

Capital seeks to deny power to those who reject its subjectification. The next section argues that its principle strategy in this war against morality is to attempt to destroy the non hegemonic state.

**Summary: The Market**

- Capitalism is the quest for freedom. Freedom is sought in the market.
- The market is a trivialization of personal choice. It trivializes all ends. It is immoral reflecting a concatenation of desires
- Freedom is evil for it trivializes all good. Spheres of life cannot be separated. The market dominates all spheres of life – it has no boundaries. The market creates Hegelian “civil society” in which everyone pursues interests through contracts. No room for families or tribes, no room for love in the market.
- The market commodifies all life practises. All acts are valued in terms of their contribution to freedom / accumulation rather than in terms of their intrinsic values. All individuals are valued not in terms of their moral worth but in terms of their contribution to freedom / accumulation.
- The bazaar is bounded by halal /haram and conventions / traditions of Islamic biradries. The bazaar is marketized when all this is abandoned and valuation is on the basis of contribution to accumulation alone.
- The market forces the individual to value all desires in accordance with their contribution to freedom / accumulation. Practises which restrict accumulation / freedom are assigned negative value. In this sense the market commodifies all being.
- The market is immoral for it produces no absolute value. Freedom is a mere nothingness. It systematically relativists all value and colonizes all social sphere. It is totalizing evil.
- Marketizing society is accepting the global hegemony of capital. This hegemony is created by state power or power of international organizations WB/WTO/IMF US laws being universalized to create a global technology market.
- Marketizing society requires the legitimizing of capitalist property – property dedicated to accumulation. Separation of ownership from control, universalizing of the wage form through out society and end to private property. No classes exist in mature capitalism, workers, owners, managers all subject to the law of accumulation.
- Capitalist regimes are regulated by both “private” and state agencies. It is the duty of the capitalist state to prevent a movement from capitalist to a non-capitalist social formation. This requires (a) universalization of avarice and covetousness (b) promotion of belief in the eternity of the world and participation in it through capital accumulation (c) promotion of faith in capital’s ability to expand freedom despite inequalities.
- All behavior which negates this has to be suppressed. Essentially required is the dominance of finance – avarice / covetousness universalized here alone. Finance must dominate everything- physical markets, factor markets, private lives. Avoiding financial crises – mismatch of claims /



obligations – main purpose of policy. Crises is always possible for expectations can be wrong. The future (time) is a closed book for economics. This shows that capitalism can be overthrown and capitalist rationality rejected.

- In Fordism pursuit of accumulation is through collective bargaining for wages. This required (a) restriction on movements of capital (b) creation of new collective identities (worker manager) which legitimated class struggles. But these new collectivities proved extra ordinarily weak and collapsed in “post Fordism”.
- Post Fordism involves (a) disorganization of labour (b) increased concentration of capital (c) limitation of the welfare state (d) pro capitalist legislation banning strikes (e) disappearance of full time life long employment (f) customization of work force through TQM.
- Reorganization of labour at workplace level is technologically possible. Post Fordism has often shifted power not to managers but from one group of workers to another (from compositors to journalists within print industry). Newly skilled workers can often seize control of technology. As technology is “privatized” it becomes firm specific and firing strategically placed skilled workers becomes very costly.
- Labour resistance to capitalism is not restricted by technological factors but by the universal commitment to human rights. Human rights dominated orders dissolve collectivities – Puritan, Nazi, Communist. But Fordism was a moment in the universalization of human rights – giving collective rights to labour was a means for making it the subject of capital. Human rights proclaim the divine right of the citizen to define the good. Collective rights were required to enable the labourer to become a citizen, a subject of capital.
- But human rights are now directly available to “labourers” through (a) growth of consumerism. The majority is the middle class and capitalist values have been internalized by all in the West (b) globalizing capital has become more powerful within the nation state reducing the scope for collective rights (c) the state is often subordinated by supra state technical agencies (IMF, WTO, EU). Collective rights have been destroyed because capital is now global / financial not national / industrial.
- Human rights are the obverse of the duty to accumulate capital. Collective rights initiated the process of converting the subject of God into the subject of capital but the new collectivity – labour – possessed an antagonistic autonomy. Collective rights enabled labour to obtain money / power by confronting capital. But as capital accumulates, power becomes disembodied. All parties have the same programmes. Voter turn outs fall. Everyone is a direct immediate subject of capital.
- But if collectivities collapse and governments are agents of corporations democracy cannot survive. Foucault, Derrida all preach resignation to the corruption that is “post democracy”. Freedom / autonomy is meaningless – that is why there is a withdrawal from citizenship. But no new collectivity can be based on human rights. Freedom has made love impossible in the West today.

### 2.3. Civil Society and The State

Pakistan is (potentially) both Islamic Society and Islamic State. The Kuffar seek to turn it into modern Pakistan (land of filthiness) by making the realization of this potential impossible. Creating modern Pakistan involves the spreading of corruption in society and in the state. The democratization of Pakistan as a key feature to convert it into a Capitalist State.

The essence of democracy is the assertion of human sovereignty – the individual’s presumed right to arbitrarily order his preferences as he wishes. Democracy creates a society of immoral equality in which every individual is recognized as equally sovereign irrespective of the quality of his private valuations - the drunkard and the fornicator is the immoral equal of the ‘abid and the zahid. Democracy specifically rejects the pattern of social stratification sanctioned by Islam. As Sheikh Abu Bakr Siraj ad Din (Martin Lings) has shown (1997 p 126 - 128) mankind is divided into three groups “those of the right, those of the left and the foremost” The Muslim community is itself divided into “those of the right”, “the righteous” and “the foremost”. The Holy Prophet (may Allah shower His choicest blessings on our lord and master) often spoke of the superiority of some of the believers over others - of Sayidna Abu Bakr, Sayidna Ali, Sayidna Abu Ubaidah and of the Sahaba as a group (Lings 1997 p. 327). The soul itself according to Islamic teaching is divided into the lower (ammara) the upper (lawamah) and the integrated whole (mutmainah).

The supreme aim of democracy is to make this integration of the soul - which tantamounts to its rejoicing acceptance of its status as Allah’s slave - impossible. Democracy teaches the individual to assert his own sovereignty – his right to submit to his own desires. A soul denying Allah empties itself for Satan and Satan fills it with lust (shahwat) and wrath (ghazab). The individual destroys his worth by seeking satisfaction of his lust and the expression of his wrath. Modern Pakistan’s civil society and the capitalist state depend crucially upon the individual’s conscious rejection of chastity (iffat) and honour (asmat). Most basically this involves the individual denial of motherhood and femininity. Democracy makes society filthy primarily by spreading sexual corruption and sexual vice and destroying haya and purdah - the segregation of the sexes. This destroys the family and as the experience of the Western countries shows increasing gender equality leads to a universalization of sexual corruption and zina and eventually to national suicide. The rate of growth of population is now negative in the majority of the Western countries - even in America the results of the 2001 census show similar results for the white race. The share of Western countries in world population has fallen from 21 percent in 1901 to 14 percent in 2001 and is expected to fall to 9 percent by 2050. Ninety eight percent of all children born during 2000 - 2020 will be in non Western countries. The dearth of children is also creating an aging crisis in the West - the over 65 who are normally less than 2 percent of a country’s population will represent almost 30 percent of the population of the West by 2050 (UN 1999). The West is dying for one simple reason - sexual

immorality and defeminization have made love and motherhood impossible. There are no biological explanations of the decline in fertility rates. It is only the diabolical worship of human rights which induces women to sacrifice children to the demon of pleasure. Abandoning God is abandoning life for the “dead heart is incapable of receiving life” as Sheikh Abubakr Siraj-ud-din teaches. The West pretends that it has forgotten death - but as Heidegger foresaw it is death alone which you can choose when you choose to worship freedom.

The most potent danger of the human rights movement is the avalanche of sexual corruption which it has unleashed throughout the world. It has effectively destroyed the family in most of Europe much of America and many parts of the third world. The HIV/AIDS epidemic is one of its first fruits - and the tolerant treatment of AIDS patients which the World Bank advocates (2000 p.163) implies that it is a natural condition of human existence in a right dominated world. Chastity and honour have become virtually meaningless - city council surveys show that 27 percent of girls under 12 were raped by their near kin or acquaintances in Liverpool in 1998. Almost 80 percent of German schoolgirls are sexually active before their thirteenth birthday. In Sweden and Norway more than 50 percent of all babies born are bastards, sexual crimes are committed at the rate of two a minute in America. Open fornication - in parks, discotheques and beaches - is becoming a common sight even in Eastern Europe. Western society has become nauseatingly filthy.

Third World countries, which have surrendered to the human rights malaise, are seeing an explosion of sexual vice. The AIDS epidemic has seized India by its throat and sexual crimes are sky rocketing. Africa has been devastated by AIDS - its economic progress has been paralyzed. It is only the Muslim world with its relatively strong moral codes and stable family structure that has shown some social resistance.

AIDS is however sweeping Bangladesh - there are reported to be hundreds of thousands of victims. The spread of AIDS is a direct consequence of the proliferation of the imperialist sponsored defeminization movements which have grown rapidly since its conquest by India.

Human rights discourse obliterates sexual morality “ I want it all and I want it now” is its theme song. Homes are destroyed and families wrecked as women surge into business, politics and education. The old are abandoned to nursing homes, the children to nurseries and crèches. Defeminization rips apart social cohesion as a knife goes through butter. As the family is ruined private space is destroyed – the individual is forever subject to the gaze of human rights imperialism. As Foucault says liberal society is capable of “bringing the effect of power to its most minute and distant elements”. No wonder one million American teenagers attempt suicide in an average year.

In order to create modern Pakistan, imperialism has launched a major human rights initiative. It sponsors NGOs and civil society organization (CSOs). Thousands of these NGOs are financed by imperialism. Some of them are involved in political sabotage but their main concern is to legitimise human rights discourse and to delegitimise state initiatives specially those concerned with challenging the systemic dominance of global capital. De-centralizing state authority is delegitimising the state's concern with issues of "high politics" and marketising the political system. NGOs/CSOs are the natural allies of global capital (and the multilateral agencies which are global capital's public agents in the Third World). Although conflict between local groups and multinationals have not been uncommon imperialism's new "civil society" initiatives seek to subsume them within the context of human rights discourse to ensure that they are not resolved in a manner which challenges the systemic dominance of global capital. A social order fractured into local groups and single-issue (Foucauldian) movements leaves little scope for the expression of collective identities. NGOs/CSOs may therefore legitimately be seen as an imperialist investment for the disorganization of labour and of lineage based communities and the establishment of the supremacy of global capital in the Third World.

Creating modern Pakistan must also involve a reorganization of the Pakistani state. The capitalist state plays an important part in creating a manageable individuality in liberal order - an individuality which accepts the maximization of freedom as the universal self evident purpose of life and which is capable of exercising self discipline in the pursuit of equal freedom.

The capitalist state is comprised of an ensemble of relationships which seek to reproduce a particular social order by enforcing collectively binding decisions on the basis of a specific conception of the general will. Sustaining a particular conception of the general will is the essential and distinguishing function of the capitalist state. The state must structure and facilitate ideological discourses which legitimize the particular conception of the general will which it seeks to sustain. Structuring this discourse involves intervention in society. State policy provides instruments for such intervention. It is one means among many through which the capitalist state seeks to structure interpersonal relationships in order to universalize particular values. Political legitimacy requires both that the individual accept certain values as consensual and the processes through which their dominance is secured as natural.

The state may be said to exist only when it possesses an administrative staff which is empowered to maintain ideological domination over the people. This administrative staff shares power with other key elements within the capitalist state system, particularly its representational strata. Policy conception, articulation, and reformulation are necessarily a multi-faceted process riddled with contradictions. State policies usually emerge from shifting, unstable alliances among groups with differing perceptions and strategies. For policy initiatives to be coherent and sustainable, there must be a stable core of support representing the perceptions of a dominant coalition partner. This dominant force must strengthen the

internal unity of the state ensemble through hegemonic state projects which provide the ideological guidelines for the conception and conduct of state policy. The purpose of the hegemonic state project and its associated policies is the individual's subjection. This involves both his subjection to the state apparatus and his self - subjection to a set of particular ideas whose consensuality is sustained by the state - these ideas provide a criterion for the evaluation of the behaviour of both the dominated and the dominant elements within the state system. According to Skinner (1989, p.51), the liberal state 'is therefore doubly impersonal, equated neither with the ruler nor with the ruled.' It is in this sense that the liberal state is conceived as 'sovereign'.

The nature of particular states depends on the particular hegemonic projects undertaken at particular points in time. Luhmann (1989) notes that new forms of organization and administration are required for state formation. State projects form particular types of states - *poleizestat*, *Reichstat*, *Sozialstat*. These different forms are not mutually exclusive. An authoritarian *Poleizestat* may pursue liberal economic projects as a means for augmenting state power. Liberal projects necessarily qualify democratic practice by placing certain 'fundamental rights' outside the framework of democratic decision - making; as Dworkin (1978) argues, the basic liberal commitment is to individualism, the 'right' of every individual to equal concern and respect, irrespective of his self-determined life plan, and not to democracy.

Similarly, liberal states need not necessarily be concerned with securing the conditions of a particular mode of capital accumulation in a given situation. Even Marxists like Jessup recognize that:

"There is no single unambiguous logic of capital - unless it be the autopetic logic of continually reproducing the circuit of capital regardless of the specific forms in which this occurs. It follows that there can be no single unambiguous reference point for state managers (determining) how the state must serve the needs and interests of capital (1990 p119).

Capital accumulation can occur under the most divergent state forms. There is little that can be said in favour of the view that a particular state form is 'required' by capital in general.

Nevertheless, the performance of certain functions by the state apparatus facilitates capital accumulation. The circuit of capital can be socialized through the state. But the state's capacities to facilitate capital accumulation are necessarily limited. This is reflected in macroeconomic policy failures such as fiscal crises, inflation, unemployment, and debt overhang. Endorsement of the state's claim to represent the popular general will against private capitalist interests necessitates its (partial) exclusion

from the heart of the production process. There are inherent limitations in using law and money as steering mechanisms. The World Bank literature on 'good governance' has noted these limitations at great length.

The state is thus an imperfect ensemble of institutions and instruments for determining individual consciousness. Moreover, the state is a terrain of struggle with different groups seeking control and dominance. Its domination over society is therefore never complete. The functioning of both state and societal processes are characterized by a relative autonomy: relative in the sense that these processes influence but cannot determine each other. They are not self-sufficient and their strategic capacities are always limited, relative to the tasks which confront them. In other words, although state policy possesses a logic of its own, it remains part of society and its capacity to determine the individual's being is contested both within and beyond its boundaries. The state's formal responsibility of sustaining a particular interpretation of the general will requires it to manage the relative autonomy and functional interdependence of the major sub-systems (cultural, political, economic) of a particular social order. The success of a state project is measured by its ability to integrate these systems into a non-necessary, socially constituted, and sustainable relative unity.

Political practices - including macroeconomic policies - are means for sustaining this relative unity of the major sub-systems of a desired social order so as to achieve a particular subjection of the individual. Assessing the effectiveness of state policies requires a specification of the desired social order and the desired subjectivity that the forces which dominate the state seek to create and sustain.

Building modern Pakistan is creating a capitalist state structure in Pakistan through the universalization of democratic practice. The purpose of democratic practice is to subject the Pakistani state to the hegemony of global capital. That is why all democratic parties - the Muslim League, and the People's Party in particular - seek imperialist support and enthusiastically espouse the imperialist economic agenda<sup>xlvi</sup>. The essential difference between Pakistan and modern Pakistan is this: Pakistan is an Islamic society and state which rejects the immorality of freedom, proclaims the sovereignty of Allah and declares jihad on universal, permanent global capital, modern Pakistan is a liberal / nationalist society and state which asserts human rights and human sovereignty and submits to the global hegemony of universal, permanent capital.

The strategy for creating modern Pakistan has two elements. First the government seeks to rapidly integrate the Pakistan economy into the global capitalist economy - this is a deliberate policy choice and not dictated by financial or technological imperatives. Pakistan's trade / GNP ratio is only about 33 per cent in a typical year and net foreign capital inflows equal about 10 percent of gross investment (PES

various Statistical appendix). The Pakistan economy performed creditably during 1999/2000 when there was no IMF surveillance - GDP growth was 4.9 percent, inflation 3.6 percent, investment efficiency rose, the trade balance improved and the Rupee did not depreciate at all for the first time in many years. We did not receive a penny in assistance from the IMF or the World Bank or the ADB or the Islamic Development Bank during that year<sup>xlvii</sup> - yet we paid more than \$600 million to these institutions as usury charges. This illustrates that a self reliant strategy is viable and fruitful even in the most difficult circumstances.

Creating modern Pakistan is a central concern of the secularists. They have handed the reins of economic policy making to agents of American imperialism. These people have spent their entire working lives as servants of Citibank, the IMF and the World Bank. It is literally true that they are on a mission.

A central project of the secularists is localization. Weakening the state is seen as necessary for creating modern Pakistan. Without this it is believed that our country cannot be subjected to the sovereignty of universal permanent capital. Localization is the transfer of authority from federal to local governments. These local governments are formed by local bodies election. But alongside these locally elected representatives they also include NGOs and representatives of secular civil society. The purpose of these local governments is to create modern Pakistan by secularizing society - marketizing not just the traditional Islamic bazaar but the mohalla, the baradri, the school, the mosque, all aspects of Muslim community life. The reservation of a proportionally large number of seats for women and for the Kuffar is a means to ensure that the local government plays this secularization and defeminization role effectively.

Marketization is the principle instrument for the secularization of society. Local governments are to be concerned with maximizing economic welfare within their territories. The local governments are to function as welfare / profit maximizing corporations. Local governments are expected to finance their activities by floating municipal bonds on national and international stock exchanges. All public services are being privatized - including even the collection of taxes and policing. It is hoped that multinational corporations and international banks will seize control of the local governments by purchasing their bonds and by participating in privatization - as is already happening in Jakarta where a multinational company has seized control of the whole urban water supply system. We can therefore see that through the localization process power is sought to be ultimately transferred from the federal government to international banks and multinational companies. Local governments are merely the local agents of global capital. Most important they are a means for reducing the commitment of the people to issues of high politics - defense, economic self reliance, ideological orientation. modern Pakistan will be fractured into local rajwaras which will surrender national sovereignty to another imperialist power, as Bhopal, Vizyanagram, Hyderabad, Rampur, Junagarh surrendered sovereignty to imperialist power Britain.

Modern Pakistan will have no independent defense, foreign or economic policy. At best it may be allowed to enjoy dominion status within the American empire, or what is more probable Modern Pakistan will collapse into India, completely abandoning Islam and reverting to Hinduism (Rizvi 2000 pp. 9-11)<sup>xlviii</sup>.

Creating Modern Pakistan through localization necessitates the universalization of human rights discourse. Universalising human rights is universalising the vices of avarice and covetousness. Human rights separates Riffat from Islam and from the ummah by teaching her self worship - her right to reject Allah's authority and will what she wills<sup>xlix</sup>. This destroys Riffat's capabilities for love and sacrifice and makes it impossible for her to participate in family life for the family is founded on love and sacrifice alone. The destruction of the family is a necessary pre requisite for the universalization of human rights discourse and for Riffat's subjection to avarice and covetousness (i.e. freedom). Universalising human rights discourse is a means for transforming Riffat from being a subject of Allah to being a subject of capital. This must involve her complete defeminisation - her total renunciation of motherhood.

Localization is thus an aspect of universalising Enlightenment norms and practices the essence of which is the worship of freedom / capital. This universalization is to be achieved by destroying national sovereignties in the Third World and subordinating them to the authority of America, which itself has become an agent of global capital. In order to understand why this is necessary we must look at America.

#### **Summary: Civil Society and the Capitalist State**

- Destroying the power of those who reject capitalist subjectification is an attempt to destroy Pakistan. Pakistan is to be converted into Modern Pakistan by democracy. In democracy all are equal, irrespective of the quality of their private valuations. Democracy rejects Islamic social stratification based on taqwa. Democracy fills the soul with lust and wrath.
- Democratic society leads to capital accumulation through degendering and spreading of the vices of avarice/covetousness and sexual immorality. Declining population in the West, sexual corruption, AIDS in India and Bangladesh. Also Africa.
- Agents for spreading sexual vice, avarice are imperialist sponsored NGOs. They seek decentralisation and marketisation of the political system. Interest orientation and single issue (Foucauldian) movements destroy communities and pave the way for the dominance of global capital.
- The liberal state creates a particular individuality which excercises self discipline for the maximisation of freedom. Interpersonal relations are also restructured for this purpose. All state



projects serve this purpose. Democracy may itself have, to be limited to ensure maximisation of freedom/accumulation (Algeria). The state represents “capital in general” this requires its exclusion from spheres of competition while managing competition. This is the essence of “good governance”. The state must manage all social sub-systems (cultural, religious, economic) to ensure the reproduction of relations of accumulation.

- A liberal state in the modern world must be subject to the global hegemony of capital. That is why all democratic parties seek imperialist support and espouse the imperialist agenda.
- Creating Modern Pakistan requires (a) integration within the world capitalist economy. This is not inevitable since  $X+M/GDP$  and  $FI/GNP$  are low. 1999/2000 performance good. IMF programmes disastrous. Foreign experts destroying the Pak economy.
- Localisation, Loss of sovereignty marketising society local government function as profit maximisers. Privatization. Floation of bonds. Domination by MNCS –NGOs local agents of liberal capital. They reduce the commitment of the people to high politics Modern Pakistan will collapse into India or America.
- Localisation leads to universalisation of human rights, defeminisation and rejection of Allah’s sovereignty. This must involve destroying Pakistan for Pakistan proclaims Allah’s sovereignty.
- Pakistan is an Islamic society and state, proclaiming Allah’s sovereignty and declaring jihad on global capital. Modern Pakistan is a liberal society/state, asserting human right and submitting to the hegemony of global capital and to America.

#### 2.4. America and Global Capitalist Order

What is the theoretical justification for seeking dissolution of national sovereignties in the Third World and the subordination of Third World polities to global capital? To answer this question we have to consider the nature of the relationship between capital and the state.

Capital may be defined as “ever expanding exchange value in the form of pure quantity” (Meszaros 1995 p.115) - this corresponds to the Christian/Islamic concept of avarice / takathur. Capital may also be described as a concrete form of freedom (Suri 1999 p.70). At least in liberal / capitalist societies both negative and positive liberties can be actualized mainly through control of capital - in practice the capitalist is freer than the non capitalist (who as Locke saw could not be wholly free lacking property).

Freedom is a continuing self-justifying quest for human self-creation, involving an assertion of man’s mastery over nature. A capitalist system has the following essential features.

- The primary means of social control are economic. The credit nexus is universally dominant. Under capitalism “money has no master”
- Profit maximization determines the organization of all production including the production of “knowledge”.
- The market is the primary means for the homogenisation of individuality and of all social practices.
- The existence of a system of valuation of all practices in terms of their contribution to accumulation - this implies the dominance of financial markets over society. Interest is the key reference price in capitalism.
- The establishment of formal equality - as a citizen -and substantive, inequality - as a subject of capital. The primary purpose of the state is to provide a political / legal framework for the continuous reproduction of formal equality and substantive inequality in capitalist society.

The state may be defined as the structure of legitimate obediences necessary for the articulation of a way of life based on the practice of consensual social values. These consensual values emerge in society (civil or religions). Liberal society (properly called civil society) comes into being when equal freedom (quest for self - creation) acquires the status of a consensual social norm. Civil society comes into being when freedom (of which capital is the main concrete form) is desired for its own sake - i.e. as an end in itself by most individuals. In Europe and America religious society was transformed into civil society during the 18<sup>th</sup> to 20<sup>th</sup> centuries. This “great transformation:” took two distinct forms the Anglo-Saxon and the Germanic. In the Anglo Saxon project freedom was achieved through the state sponsored development of a free market (Gray 1999). In America, for example the free market was established by the merciless slaughter of fifteen million Red Indians (among other state initiatives). In Germany freedom was sought through the development of a political commitment to a nationalist Weltanschauung - the market was subordinated to the sovereign will of the political community, which sought freedom not for the individual but for the community as a whole.

As Gray has perceptibly pointed out (1999. Chp1) America seeks to universalise the Anglo Saxon quest for freedom. This commitment to the Anglo-Saxon - rather than the Germanic - project is not perverse or myopic (as Gray seems to believe). It's selection is determined by a crucial weakness of capitalist order. Capital accumulation and concentration logically entails the disorganization and atomisation of labour. The movement of capital logically disorganizes and decomposes the political communities, which sustain capitalism - and does not articulate a morality for the constitution of a new political community. “Universal citizenship” is inherently incompatible with globalization for such citizenship (like national

citizenship) would inevitably stand in the way of capital accumulation. That is why weakening of (say) German citizenship does not lead to a strengthening of European citizenship and federal Europe is necessarily a New Right project. In civil society it is capital, which is sovereign concretely, and this sovereignty is exercised over the citizen who is a subject of capital - and whose sovereignty is an abstraction, a medium for the realization of the concrete sovereignty of capital. The citizen possesses the standard negative freedoms and Kantian autonomy. These freedoms are endorsed in a constitutional order founded on a recognition of assumedly inviolable human rights.

Constitutional orders operationalise the practice of the doctrine of Toleration which restricts the pursuit of collectivist ends to facilitate personal autonomy. The political community does not possess the right to override human rights. Since human rights can be articulated mainly by accessing capital in civil society they can be viewed as the obverse of the duty to accumulate capital. The doctrine of Toleration is thus a legitimization of the subordination of the (abstract) sovereignty of the citizen to the (concrete) sovereignty of capital.

There is no such thing as a liberal community which is not in a process of self-destruction for capitalism necessarily corrodes the pre liberal moralities on which liberal public order is founded. Personal autonomy can be seen as negatively associated with state power and positively associated with the growth of the sovereignty of capital. It is in this sense that personal autonomy is a community destroying force.

Capital has now outgrown the nation state. It needs a state, which delegitimizes citizen's national sovereignty (except as an abstraction). The focus on human rights, Toleration and pluralism is a means for achieving this delegitimation of the citizen's national sovereignty through a weakening of the nation state. There are two essential steps that must be taken to ensure nation state disintegration and subordination to global capital.

First national identities and high politics must be de-legitimised. The World Bank's priority concern with localization reflects this initiative. "Autonomous" civic governments will be less concerned with issues of national ideology, foreign policy and state power. The citizen will see himself primarily as a consumer. He will be willing to bargain with the agents of global capital directly, unencumbered with collectivist ideological and power preoccupations. "Civic communities" are a contradiction in terms. Modern cities destroy communities. They are the natural habitat of the isolated, atomised, self-determining practitioner of human rights. Hong Kong, Panama, Costa Rica, Macao and Singapore illustrate the reality of civic governance - its total subservience to global capital and its comprehensive rejection of high politics.

Second the transformation of the citizen into a consumer and the delegitimation of high politics require a bureaucratization of the later. Issues regarding the defense of capitalist world order and regulation of global commodity and finance markets must be removed from the arena of public choice. The UN and its specialized agencies provide the resources for this bureaucratization of high politics. The Security Council, the Peace Keeping Missions, the WTO, the IMF and the World Bank have been crafted to serve as the public agents of global capital. Their task is to replace “the government of people by the administration of things” through the technicalisation of the issues of high politics such as legitimization of American terrorist attacks throughout the world, disarmament, financial market de-regulation, trade liberalization, immigration, aging policy and environmental management. Technicalisation and “depoliticisation” of such issues is necessary because the national democratic decision-making process even in America will not produce the type of results required to sustain and extend the dominance of global capital. The nation state must therefore be transcended not by a global democracy but by the bureaucratic, technocratic tyranny of global capital. A global democracy cannot be built for the concentration of capital requires the disintegration of political communities. Universalization of human rights is a means for the disintegration of political communities at the national level. It is a means for social atomisation. Human rights are asserted against political communities, they cannot of course provide a foundation for the formation of a global community represented in a world state.

Globalization manifests liberalism’s contingent, non-necessary endorsement of democracy. Liberalism is the political justification of the public order of capital - it is nothing else. That is why all classical liberals argue that a commitment to personal autonomy implies endorsement of capitalist property. Human rights require the universalization of capitalist property since human rights practices presume the objectification of labour and the atomisation of the social agent. Capitalist property is the primordial form of individual liberty (Summers 1968 p.137). Liberalism endorses the democratic process when the anticipated out come is an extension of human rights and capitalist property. When democratic practices threaten to restrict capitalist property and human rights liberal policy is necessarily anti democratic. The post modern liberal project of globalization is anti democratic for democratic practice even in the West threatens to create public identities demanding restraint on the universalization of human rights and capitalist property. Liberalism therefore seeks to transfer political power from the natural habitat of the sovereign citizen - the nation state and to lodge it at levels (local and global) where the citizen is deprived of his sovereignty and rendered incapable of contesting the sovereignty of capital.

Democratic process in the Third World is likely be more subversive of capitalist property and human rights since globalization is necessarily an inequalizing, immiserizing phenomenon and takes place largely at the expense of the mustadafeen (the disempowered) in the third world - for one South Korea one can count fifty Congos. Democracy in the third world may become a threat to global capital and human rights imperialism. Hence the nation state must be disempowered and sovereignty transferred to the state of global capital, America (Zakaria 2003).

Disempowering third world states is also an urgent America strategic need. As Peterson (1999) shows the twenty first century is likely to see a perceptible decline in the global power of the West. Demographic factors are the underlying determinants of this loss of power. It is estimated that by 2030 the ratio of working taxpayers to pensioners will fall to 1.5:1 - as against 3:1 in 2000 in the OECD countries. People over 65 will constitute roughly a third of the population of these countries. This rapid increase in the elderly represents an increasingly ominous fiscal burden for the OECD countries. It is officially estimated that the OECD countries will have to spend an extra 9 to 16 percent of their GDP during 2000 - 2030 merely to meet their old age benefit commitments. To finance this an increase of 30 to 40 percent in existing taxation levels in the OECD countries will be required. Clearly this is politically unfeasible so governments would have to have very high fiscal deficits absorbing much of the saving of the OECD countries and / or drastically cut old age benefits. Aging OECD countries will seek to attract third world savings to finance their fiscal deficits<sup>1</sup>.

Defense expenditure would also have to be cut back to pay for old age benefits. As populations shrink not even America the sole rogue super power will be able to afford a growth in its defense spending. Falling populations will mean smaller imperialist armies. Capital intensity of imperialist war machines will increase and America will usually respond to challenges to the hegemony of global capital by terrorist attacks on the third world states and all out attacks with nuclear weapons. But Pakistan (i.e. Islamic society and state) possesses nuclear weapons and has an increasing capacity to retaliate effectively to super power terrorist attacks through the mobilization of the mujahideen.

Peterson writes "The richest industrial powers of the future (will) be demographically imploding, capital importing, fiscally starving neutrals who twist and turn to avoid expensive international entanglements "(1999 p. 50). Moreover the West will be increasingly dependent on the Third World for surplus capital and as a home for its investments.

But Third World countries will fund imperialist expenditure<sup>li</sup> and investment only if they have been subordinated to the public order of global capital. As Peterson recognizes the main danger to imperialist global hegemony come from "the most rapidly urbanizing, most institutionally unstable areas, (which) are most likely to fall under the sway of revolutionary leadership. (These) are the societies that spawned most of the military strongmen who have bedeviled the United States and Europe in recent decades"(1999 p.51).

The long term planners of the Pentagon predict that urban revolutionary upsurge in the third world will provide a major challenge to the rogue super state America in the first decade of the twenty first century. Pentagon strategists are particularly apprehensive of "youth bulges" in the world's poorest

urban centres. Localization is a strategy for using the revolutionary zeal of poor urban youth to fuel secessionist movements leading to the disempowerment of nation states throughout the third world.

America is uniquely suited to play the role of a surrogate global state disciplining the individual, society and non capitalist states to organize subjection to global capital - moreover no other political structures exist at present which can enable global capital to exercise its systemic sovereignty. Thus while global capital weakens other states, it strengthens America. American policies for tightening imperialist control are immensely popular with the American people, as every President and aspirant President knows. American state terrorism will increase because it will become immensely popular domestically - much as gladiatorial contests became all the rage during the dying days of the Roman empire. In order to understand this phenomenon we will have to look closely at American society.

Merciless slaughter of defenseless people is the dominant theme of American history. Fifteen million Red Indians were systematically butchered over a period of two hundred years and an entire continent stolen from them - much as the Zionists are now murdering and plundering Palestine. The Red Indians have been followed by Mexicans, Moros, Koreans, Vietnamese, Cambodian, Lao, Serbs, Afghans and Iraqis in this never ending horror story of the blood thirsty American quest for world domination.

But such savagery is not confined to American's dealings with strangers. It characterizes all public life in America. Today America's prison population rose. It now stands at well over two million. American imprisonment rates are now more than six times higher than those of Britain, Canada or France. In addition to this a further 3.3 million Americans are on probation and over 700,000 on parole. One percent of all white American males and 9 percent of all black American males are currently in prison. Over 1.2 million black male Americans are on probation or parole. Incarceration rates have more than doubled for both white and black American males during the past twenty years.

The American Bureau of Justice Statistics predicted in 1999 that a third of all American black males will go to prison during their life time. Thirty three percent of all black male Americans are currently under some form of 'correctional' control as against 15 percent of all white males in America.

The crime industry is booming in America - a quarter of all living Americans have been victims of violence during their lives - as against only 17 percent in strife torn Northern Ireland. Increase in imprisonment has however failed to check criminal behaviour. Thus the number of people imprisoned for drug abuse rose by twelve hundred percent during 1979 to 1997 but the Bureau of Justice Statistics data shows that drug abuse is rampant throughout America. The percentage of American high school

seniors who thought it easy to get hold of 'mild' drugs such as marijuana rose from 88 percent in 1975 to 89 percent in 1995. The share of American school children who thought it easy to get hold of 'hard core' drugs increased from 37 percent to 49 percent during this period. The rising purity of drugs and increased drugs use has led to a four-fold increase in drugs related deaths during 1979-1997. HIV and Hepatitis C epidemics are also growing in tandem.

The booming American crime economy is offering glamorous lifestyles and attractive career opportunities. A life devoted to crime involves little risk for the US police force is amongst the most corrupt and least efficient in the world. The Bureau of Justice Statistics estimates that in 1997 only 3 percent of violent crimes led to prison sentences in America. The majority of cases remain unresolved and the American legal profession has now become an inseparable component of the national crime industry.

The criminalisation of the American justice system received an impetus during Nixon's vicious persecution of the Black Panthers. Since then the American Justice administration has learnt how to use the introduction of drugs and the organization of gang warfare as a means for controlling the inner cities. The US police has learnt how to induce urban riots so as to murder its victims methodically. The abuses at Abu Gharib are a mild reflection of the torture and rape that is routine in prisons throughout America.

It is not only the criminals who thrive on crime in America, the justice department, the police force and the legal professions all share the booty. Business also prospers for as imprisonment rates increase prisons have to be built all over the country. As wealth concentrates the bloated financial sector pulls investment away from inner cities, small towns and even suburbia. Constructing prison buildings is a means for offsetting these wealth-inequalizing pressures and hence the prison industry has become both lucrative and popular. It provides local jobs.

We can now speak (as Ladipo does) of a new "prison industrial complex" comprising of builders, subcontractors, trade unionists, local and state administrators etc. The prison industry is also being privatized and privately run prisons are attracting lucrative federal and state contracts. The Corrections Corporation of America (CCA) leads the powerful and increasingly influential private prison industry. The second largest private prison firm Wackenhut. Correction is run by Reagan's former National Security Advisor. The Information and Communication Technology (ICT) industry has also found the prison industrial complex useful - for prisoners phone collect and can be charged higher rates. Booming tech stocks thus require booming prison population. Prisons have also become a source of cheap labour for the multinationals. Prison made output sales increased by 335 percent during 1980 to 1994 and in 1997 were well in excess of \$3 billion TWA, Microsoft and Starbucks are among the leading employers of prison labour.

There are many stakeholders - police officers, lawyers, judges, local and federal officials, multinationals and labour leaders - benefiting from the prosperity of American criminality. They seek to ensure that the criminal population continues to grow. The most effective means for ensuring this is prison life itself.

American prisons systematically brutalize the new prisoner. Rape is the most common means for ensuring discipline. A 1994 survey of a Midwestern prison revealed that 22 percent of male prisoners had been raped. The Stop Prisoners Rape Group estimates that about 300,000 males are raped annually in US prison - usually repeatedly. The youngest and most vulnerable are routinely targeted. It is now widely accepted that almost every American woman prisoner is routinely raped by guards, officials, visitors procured by guards and fellow prisoners. The prisoners at Abu Gharib are merely experiencing what is normal practise in American prisons.

The total officially recognized criminal population of America is about 6 million and growing at an annual average rate of about 11 percent. Once a criminal always a criminal - this is ensured by conditions inside the prison and by American social conditions generally. Sammuels estimates that the total population benefiting directly or indirectly from the crime economy was about 67 million in 1995 - about a quarter of all Americans benefit from the continuing criminalisation of American society. Is there any wonder that they enthusiastically applaud the global crimes of the American State?

How did America become such a sick society and the average American citizen a neurotic, paranoid, demonic, psychopath? An answer to this question requires an understanding of American history.

The founding fathers of the British colonies in North America were no ordinary criminals - they were criminals who justified their crimes in the name of Christianity. The pioneers sallied forth to murder, rob, rape and spread diseases among the Red Indians with Christian hymns on their lips and crosses in their hands. This process lasted for several centuries - as John Dee has shown in his path breaking study Bury My Heart at Wounded Knee, Abraham Lincoln was an enthusiastic Red Indian slaughterer.

Protestant Christianity's greatest crime against God was its sponsoring of Red Indian genocide in North America. God's holy book - the Bible - was grotesquely distorted to justify these crimes and lay the foundations of a rapacious, marauding state system in which the White Man claimed sovereignty and justified his revolt against God.



The Federalist Papers, which provide the conceptual framework of the American constitution are replete with such claims. Whitman and Dewey are apostles of human sovereignty. Their modern day disciple Richard Rorty brags that “America is the only country which seeks not to please God but to please ourselves”. In Achieving Our Country Rorty celebrates America’s rebellion against God and argues that “we have the right to forgive ourselves the crimes we committed” (1998 p73) and continue to commit.

The essential doctrine of the American Constitution is “La ilha illa Insan” - man has the inalienable right to define good and evil and to live a life, which pleases himself. Society is based on a (constitutional) contract, which facilitates accumulation to enable man to please himself. The supreme moral duty, of which human rights are merely a corollary, is the duty to accumulate capital.

Capitalism compels man to accumulate capital for its own sake. Human rights are merely a means for performing this duty. Capital is intrinsically evil in itself and fosters the growth of the vices of avarice and covetousness (competition) A rights based society is a society which necessarily distorts individual perception and promotes immorality.

In such a society the individual forgets death and seeks to become God. This widespread self obsession destroys individual morality. In such a society love is impossible and the conquest of nature - most importantly human nature - turns every man into a predator. This rights obsessed predator wars against God and wars against himself. His life is vicious, demonic and frustrating because he seeks to usurp God’s authority and worship his own self.

The American constitution and the global human rights movement which it has spawned ridicules the holy texts and seeks to trample on God’s commands. No wonder America and its associated human rights entourage regard the Muslims as their primary enemies and - in Iraq and Palestine and Afghanistan and Kashmir - continue their campaign of mass terror and genocide. Islam challenges human rights discourse and the satanic social orders it sustains. Islam rejects man’s right to interpret God’s will and seeks to construct a moral political system on the basis of man’s total and unconditional surrender to God.

The emergence of such an order would destroy global capitalism and its agency can only be an Islamic state.

Destroying state authority in the Muslim world is therefore an important need of global capitalism which is characterized by the increasing dominance of the financial markets over systems of production and exchange. Corporate management is today more subject to finance market discipline than ever before and restructuring today typically involves state de-regulation. This systemic dominance of finance is embedded in the nature of capital (avarice and covetousness). The limitless expansion of financial

markets reflects the inherent insatiability of desire – there are no limits to the growth of avarice and jealousy.

Unlimited expansion of capital requires universalization of rules and procedures throughout the world – the creation not just of global markets but also of global state structures. This globalization of rules, procedures and norms is a requirement of the functioning of the global debt market for it is government issued debt instruments which serve as the bench mark for the determination of the price of all debt – i.e. the structure of interest rates. It is in this sense that we can assert that public debt remains at the basis of the structure of private debt. Finance capital and its limitless expansion requires that states pursue “risk free” policies i.e. policies that do not endanger the limitless expansion of finance. The financial markets punish states which act “irresponsibly”, but their capacity to do so is constrained. They can destroy Argentina, crush Indonesia, relegate Korea, humble France – but they cannot punish America without seriously injuring themselves.

While most “autonomous” central banks have become instruments of global finance – means for subordinating national economies to global financial markets – this is not true of the Federal Reserve System (Blinder 1998). The health of the US economy is a pre-condition for the health of the globalized financial system. The Americanization of the international regulatory regimes, through the work of the Bank of International Settlements, the IMF, the World Trade Organization and private and quasi-private sector regulatory bodies in accountancy, intellectual property, legislation determination of quality standards etc, reflects the strength of the American state as an ultimate guarantor of the dominance of global finance.

It is sometimes held that globalization has been an American state project – “made by America”. The US government has had a key role in mediating financial crises in the 1990s. In 1998 the Wall Street Journal stated “the sad fact is that the international banks never accomplish much unless pushed by the US Treasury” and Rudi Dornbusch summed up the impact of the East Asia crisis thus “the positive side is that South Korea is now owned and operated by the US Treasury” (both quoted in Panitch 2000 p.5). The American state has been strengthened by the globalization of finance.

The political nature of global finance was captured in one of Nicos Poulantzis seminal studies over three decades ago (1975). He saw multinational capital as an agent of social transformation subordinating both host country markets and the host country states to America. This according to Poulantzis lead to the creation of a “new type of non territorial imperialism, implanted and maintained... thought the induced reproduction of the form of the dominant imperialist power within each national formation and its state” (P46). Globalization requires “the extended reproduction within (each dominated national formation) of the ideological and political conditions for the development of American imperialism” (Poulantzis 1975 p.47). American ideology (the ideology of human rights) markets and governance process must achieve hegemony in the sense that they alone are recognized as legitimately ordained “imperatives of reason” (Kant’s “categorical imperatives”, Habermas “necessary pre-suppositions”). State elites, in every country, have to be taught to Americanize local markets and governance processes and to subordinate them to America. As Edward Conor shows in great detail (1998) officials from the US Department of Defence, the US Treasury the IMF, the World Bank and the WTO play a crucial role in negotiating terms on which US hegemony is institutionalized in both metropolitan (i.e. European) and non-metropolitan states. Similarly Vogel (1996) and Moran (1994) have presented impressive evidence

to show that the liberalization of financial markets, privatization and de-regulation all depend crucially on US sponsorship and support.

“America in every important respect.... has the predominant power to shape frameworks and influence outcomes. This implies that it can draw the limits within which others choose from a restricted list of options the restrictions being in large part a result of US decisions” (Strange 1989 p.169). Strange’s description of US hegemony needs to be quoted at some length.

“What is emerging therefore is a non-territorial empire with its imperial capital in Washington, D.C. where imperial capitals used to draw courtiers from outlying provinces, Washington draws lobbyists from outlying enterprises, outlying minority groups, and globally organized pressure groups... As in Rome, citizenship is not limited to a master race and the empire contains a mix of citizens with full legal and political rights, semicitizens and noncitizens like Rome’s slave population. Many of the semicitizens walk the streets of Rio or of Bonn, of London or Madrid, shoulder to shoulder with the noncitizens; no one can necessarily tell them apart by color or race or even dress. The semicitizens of the empire are many and widespread. They live for the most part in the great cities of the noncommunist world. They include many people employed by the large transnational corporations operating in the transnational production structure and serving as they are all very well aware, a global market. They include the people employed in transnational banks. They often include members of the ‘national’ armed forces, those that are trained, armed by, and dependent on the armed forces of the United States. They include many academics in medicine, natural sciences, and social studies like management and economics who look to U.S. professional associations and to U.S. universities as the peer group in whose eyes they wish to shine and to excel. They include people in the press and media for whom U.S. technology and U.S. examples have shown the way” (1989 p. 167).

Zhigieniew Brerzhenski notes that “the three great imperatives of (US) geopolitical strategy are to prevent collusion and maintain dependence among the vassals, to keep tributaries pliant and to keep the barbarians from coming together” (1997 p.40). These objectives are to be achieved by Americanizing societies and governance processes of both “vassal” and “barbarian” states.

As Rizvi (2001) argues America is the first state which justifies its existence on the grounds of capital accumulation (‘liberty’ and ‘pursuit of happiness’ in the Jeffersonian formulation). Human rights ideology is America’s national ideology Americanizing societies and states on a global scale requires the prior legitimization of universal human rights. Only constitutional, liberal states seeking integration in world capitalist markets and accepting American systemic hegemony are recognized as legitimate repositories of (limited) national sovereignty in the global order of human rights imperialism. States which refuse to accept the (unlimited) sovereignty of capital and American hegemony (Islamic Afghanistan, North Korea, Cuba, pre war Iraq) must be subjected to unrelenting genocide. There is No

Alternative strategy or policy because human rights imperialism demands man's total, unconditional, final and eternal surrender to capital.

We will continue to struggle against human rights imperialism because we believe in Allah's sovereignty (His attribute of being Malik-ul-Mulk). We reject the sovereignty of capital and see human rights ideology as a means for the universalisation of the vices of avarice and covetousness. Human rights imperialism ordains the existence of civil society in which all moral ends are regarded as equally trivial and in which outcomes are valued strictly in accordance with their contribution to capital accumulation. Human rights imperialism compels us to Americanize our society and our governance processes and to submit to the systemic hegemony of America.

For these reasons we will continue to struggle against human rights ideology and human rights imperialism.

***Summary: America and Globalization***

- America is the state of global capital. The state reconciles formal political equality and substantive market inequality for sustaining capitalism. The state/ market civil society dominated by takathur. In Eroupe free markets/civil society created by the state. The US established the free market by the slaughter of the Red Indians.
- America seeks to universalize the quest for freedom. But a global capitalist state is not possible for it requires a global community which capital can't produce since there is no other. (as in nationalism).
- Universalizing human rights is treating value as trivial – this is the doctrine of Toleration –the social dominance of exchange value. Toleration is the recognition of capital's sovereignty. This must destroy communities.
- Governance by capital takes the place of governance by nation/communities. The citizen becomes a consumer an investor – a subject of capital and of its state America. This means that high politics are beaurocratised. Defence of world capitalist order and regulation of markets must be beaurocratised/removed from public choice – the Security Council, the peace keeping missions, IMF, WTO, all agents of American beaurocracy. Technicalization of issues such as disarmament, American terrorism, trade liberalization, financial de-regulation, emigration, ageing policy. The nation state is subjected to global beaurocratic tyranny. The ideology of this bearuuoratic tyranny is human rights. Human rights ensure that democratic practices cannot frustrate capitalist sovereignty – democratic politics must destroy Islam (Algeria, Turkey).
- American dominance of Pakistan is necessary, because of demography. In OECD. (a) taxpayers to non taxpayers ratio will fall from 3.0 to 1.5 over 2000-2030 (b) over 65 population will rise to 30 percent

of total (c) 10% of GDP will have to be allocated for pension payments requiring massive tax increases. Therefore government deficits would have to rise Defense expenditure cut back required. American terrorism and nuclear attacks will increase as population and army shrinks. America will become more dependent on third world savings and investment.

- Urban revolutionary upheaval feared. America wants to direct revolutionary zeal towards secessionist not anti imperialist movements.
- Global capital strengthens America because American state and society are uniquely suitable for sustaining capitalist global hegemony.
- American society.
  - Slaughter of Red Indians, Mexicans, Moros, Koreans, Vietnamese, Iraqis.
  - Prison population, 2 million plus 4 million on probation and parole.
  - 1 percent of whites 10 percent of blacks in prisons.
  - Crime soaring. Prison population doubled 1980-2000.
  - Thirty three percent of all black males expected to go to prison during their life.
  - 25 percent of all living American victims of violent crime.
  - 50 percent of all school children use drugs.
  - US police most corrupt 3 percent crimes conviction rate.
  - Police officers, business, justice dept., trade unions all benefit from the crime industry total population benefiting directly/indirectly 67 million.
- Rejecting Allah's sovereignty a central feature of the American constitution. America is free to please itself. Capital accumulation and Tolerance sacred. America the natural state of global capital America Islam's natural enemy for Islam rejects freedom and asserts the sovereignty of Allah.

## Chapter 3

### Justifying and Governing Capitalism

This chapter will argue that seeking the transcendence and overthrow of capitalist order requires an explicit rejection of the social sciences for the social sciences legitimate capitalist order and supply capitalism's governance technology. Contemporary Islamic scholarship and contemporary Islamic revolutionary activism has often adopted a quasi conciliatory stance towards social science methodologies and the policies generated by an application of social scientific thought to contemporary problems. We argue that an explicit rejection of the social scientific episteme is required for a delegitimation of the norms and structures of the Western way of life and for its supercession by Islam.

The chapter is divided into four sections. We begin by very briefly tracing the genealogy of the social sciences and identifying the metaphysical foundation underlying social science methodologies and practices. We argue that the social sciences are teleological – not value neutral – and their essential purpose is to legitimate and operationalize capitalism. Subsequent sections show how three major social sciences – economics political science and social theory – perform the function of capitalist legitimation and the operationalization and structuring of capitalist practices. In chapter IV we will show how Islamic economics, the sociology of Islam and Islamic constitutionalism have become means for subordinating Islamic norms and practices to capitalist order. This illustrates the inherent danger involved in employing social science methodologies for developing Islamic policy responses to contemporary problems.

#### 3.1. The Genealogy and Telos of the Social Sciences

Social sciences are of recent origin. Their origin may be traced to the revival of classical philosophy in the seventeenth century and its formal separation from theology, expressed most emphatically in a downgrading of Aristotelian thought and an espousal of the empiricist methodologies. The appearance of the social sciences is coterminous with the appearance of modern man. The essence of modernity is post Christian secularism. Secularism transforms man's conception of being and his relationship to the world. Man sees himself, not as part of creation but as actual or potential creator/master of nature. This is both an epistemological and an ethical claim. Since man is (actual or potential) creator the telos/purpose of theoretical and practical reason is the articulation of this creativity / mastery. The promotion of power / pleasure as the purpose of all theoretical and practical activity is provided justification by Francis Bacon in the 16<sup>th</sup> / 17<sup>th</sup> century. "The true and lawful end of the sciences" he writes "is that human life be enriched" (cited in Roberts 1997 p451). Bacon is a founding father of both Empiricism and Utilitarianism. Bacon's work also illustrates the close association between modern science and modern philosophy – the former rests upon indispensable assumptions about the nature of being and of the world provided by the latter. The natural sciences conceived of the universe as a mechanical system in which change was a consequence of the uniform and universal working of the laws of nature which were not dependent on God's will. In this conception God was at most a watch maker and the act of creation effectively ended with the manufacture of the clock that was the universe. Post Newtonian science sees the universe as a self regulating, self contained dynamic order. In this conception truth itself is a consequence of self discovery – not revealed by God. The Enlightenment saw reason as an instrument for self discovery and self fulfillment, not for serving God. The only authority is

the self's desires – for as Locke taught moral values reflected merely the mind's experience of pleasure and pain. The value of knowledge was determined by utility / pleasure and this was specially so as far as the practical (physical and social) sciences were concerned. Practical reason decreed wealth not virtue to be its objective. The Kantian and Humean strains of Enlightenment complement and reinforce each other for freedom is seen as a necessary condition for well being and well being / happiness is a pre condition for freedom. The inherent anti clericalism of the Enlightenment movement – both Rationalism and Remittantism – reflects this commitment to power and pleasure. Man should not submit to God nor should he seek to please Him. Man is free to make of the world what he wills and pleasing himself is the only purpose of rational activity.

The social sciences – anthropology, economics, political science, psychology and sociology – share the Enlightenment's conception of being and of knowledge. The transition from Christian to humanist belief took place over several centuries in Europe and both the natural and social sciences are products of this transition. The natural and the social sciences thus share common metaphysical presumptions – but the social sciences are a more comprehensive and unreserved endorsement of the Enlightenment's basic beliefs. There is no such thing as a pre Enlightenment economics or a pre Enlightenment sociology and the essential purpose of the invention of economics and sociology is to realize the Enlightenment objectives of self fulfillment and material progress. As against this pre Enlightenment physics and chemistry did exist and even in the work of Newton Enlightenment metaphysical presumptions are not fully endorsed and some room remains for traditional religious beliefs<sup>lii</sup>.

Accepting social science methodologies necessitates accepting Enlightenment presumptions regarding the nature of being and knowledge. Quite explicitly social sciences commit their practitioners to a specific amalgamation of the philosophies of Hume and Kant. For Hume nothing exists but sensations. Reason is a slave of the passions (1951 p451) not an autonomous human capability. Reason can therefore provide no proof of natural laws or of causative processes but Hume argues men have a natural propensity to presume the universality of natural laws and in Hume's view this intuitive belief in natural regularity necessitated a rejection of all religious doctrine. Hume's empiricism provides the philosophical underpinnings for the utilitarian approach common to all social sciences – utilitarianism is the translation into social and moral theory of the core of Humean empiricism. Human behaviour – individual and institutionalized – is to be judged not in terms of religious edicts but on the basis of this worldly pleasure maximizing consequences. The application of this felicific calculus to acts, individuals and performance of institutions provided an indispensable basis for the justification of capitalist order. It is also a basis for justifying democracy for all human beings are seen on having the same passions and in the felicific calculus every individual counts as one.

Kant was an avid student of Hume; Kant strongly endorsed the cognitive claims of empiricist based sciences. As we have seen in Chp.2 Kant did not reject the Humean claim that the senses provide no proof of the existence of natural laws or causative processes. Instead Kant presumed that the notion of causality and objectivity are inscribed in the structure of the human mind. Our experience of the external world is shaped / structured by pre-existing mental categories. "The self" says Kant "does not derive its laws from but prescribes them to nature" (1954 p67) for "it possesses an order which is fixed and inalienable in all of us" (p73). Kant agrees with Hume that the world is not "out there" but "in us"

Kant's assertion that "objects must confirm to knowledge" (1966 p75) implies that it is the self which determines the structure of experiences.

The self imposes the one possible set of structures upon the world, which it has discovered by categorizing its sensations to recognize objects and their relations and by developing concepts on the basis of such 'understanding'. The self is thus the basic source of all experiences and concepts. Kant describes it as "transcendental" in that it is the necessary and universal basis of all experiencing and conceptualizing<sup>liii</sup>. The self possesses "a priori knowledge of the concept of an object and the process of causation<sup>liv</sup> and reality must conform to those structures of the mind.

Man is autonomous in that he can unaided discover truth. Kant's emphasis on rights and duties do not – as we have seen – represent a definitive break with empiricism. Rule utilitarianism (following Mill) endorses both individual rights and universalizability. Despite its focus on separable phenomena empiricism seeks to investigate what it takes to be an orderly structure of the world. The utilitarian calculus is grounded on a basis – every individual counting as a basis – which Kant justifies in the form of autonomy. Empiricism and Kantian mechanism compliment each other in the Enlightenment project and both seek to defeat a common enemy, religion. Both Hume and Kant opened the way for the development of the liberal social order in which the rational, pleasure seeking human individual replaced God as the source of creation, knowledge and value.

In the 19<sup>th</sup> century Mill was to write "over his own body and mind the individual is sovereign" (1960 p15). This illustrates the common commitment of utilitarianism and Kantianism to freedom. Much earlier Bentham and Smith had recognized that freedom was to be sought in wealth not in virtue. Liberalism and capitalism are committed to the elimination not of vice but of (absolute) poverty and as Smith argues, to the promotion of the "passion for money making". In his Theory of Moral Sentiments Smith speaks of "self interest" as the legitimate summation of all passion and this as Hirschman has shown is an essential moral argument justifying capitalism (1977). Capitalism according to Smith emerged as an unintended consequence of the pursuit of self interest of the "great proprietors" and "merchants and artificers" (1981 p.370). Capitalist order is justified according to Smith because it establishes liberal political rule and ensures world wide plenty<sup>lv</sup>. Smith recognized that sustaining capitalist order requires the existence and reproduction of an individuality focused on the pursuit of (this worldly) self interests and committed to the legitimacy of liberal rights. It is the universalization of this type of individuality which ensures that expansion of the market and dominance of the rule of law (of capital) become inextricably interlinked. The market is both a means and an end of/for the universalization of liberal rights. The market and the liberal state are instruments for the expression of the theoretical sovereignty of the individual and his practical subjection to capital in public life and to the passions in his moral valuation<sup>lvi</sup>.

The principal function of the social sciences is to justify capitalist order. Explicitly this entails the justification of:

- Capitalist individuality – being dominated by avarice and covetousness and rationality seeking truth through understanding human will and imposing its order on the world.



- Capitalist property – the organization of production and exchange with the objective of continuous expansion of capital in the form of pure quantity and the subjugation of all valuation to the logic of capital accumulation<sup>lvii</sup>.
- Rule of law of capital – an order realizing the simultaneous reproduction of theoretically sovereign but practically subjected individuality.

The social sciences also provide a framework for ensuring the practical functionality of capitalism. Capitalist order must produce both abundance and liberties in ever expanding amounts continuously. This requires a continuous readjustment of the market state relationship which the social sciences facilitate. They provide tools for constructing relationships that balance the need for expanded capital accumulation with the need for avoiding marginalization and exclusion from social order of that overwhelming majority of capitalism's subjects who do not accumulate but are the subjects of capital.

Both the legitimating and the functional role of the social sciences are of fundamental importance for the continuing reproduction of capitalist order. This is so because capitalist order is not natural. Men do not naturally submit to the rule of capital (avarice/covetousness) Men are not naturally self interested and there are no moral / theological grounds available for legitimating self interest as a life governing principle (Bell 1976). Men are not free and do not naturally seek freedom. They have to be forced to be free by capital. Even Hayek can write, "man has not developed in freedom. Freedom was made possible by the disciplines of civilization" (1979 p.163). The social sciences provide the technologies of governance necessary for the creation and sustenance of capitalist order – an order in which man is subjected to freedom (avarice/covetousness). In the following section we shall seek to describe how three major social sciences – economics and political science – legitimate capitalist order and provide technologies for its governance.

#### **Summary: The Geneses and Telos of the Social Sciences: A Summary**

- Social science methodologies are teleological – not value neutral. Their essential purpose is to legitimate and provide the technologies of governance for creating and sustaining capitalist order.
- Social sciences presume the validity of the central proposition of Kantian mechanism and empiricism / utilitarianism.
- Social sciences are committed to a secular conception of being and the world. Man is a (an actual or potential) creator of the world and the purpose of practical reason is to establish man's mastery over the world.
- Social sciences presume the universe to be a self contained self regulating dynamic mechanism the laws of motion of which are to be discovered /determined by self reflection. Knowledge is a product of the self understanding of the self which imposes its order on the world. The self itself

cannot be known for it is the condition of knowledge. Reason is a means for practicing the universalisable commands of the (unknowable) self.

- The social sciences are committed to freedom – the unlimited right of the self is to will its ends. Belief in the self legislating self eliminates the need for seeking any moral authority for granting the self this unlimited right.
- The social sciences are an unreserved and total endorsement of the beliefs underlying mechanism and utilitarianism. The social sciences are means for the realization of Enlightenment ends – self fulfillment and progress. There is therefore no room in the social sciences for the recognition of God as sustainer (Rabb) as there is in Newtonian physics.
- The social sciences recognize reason as a slave of the passions. All individual acts and institutions are to be judged on the basis of the felicific calculus. Wealth not virtue is an end in itself. Man is recognized as sovereign in the basic sense that he is the sole legitimate possessor of his body. The social sciences are committed to the elimination not of vice but of poverty and to the promotion of the passion for money making.
- Capitalism is the universalization of this passion – the universalization of avarice and covetousness. The social sciences legitimate and provide technologies of governance for operationalizing the rule of capital in the market and in the state.

### 3.2. Economics

While Schumpeter begins his History from Greeco-Roman times he traces the emergence of economics as a separate science from the middle of the seventeenth to the end of the eighteenth century appearing as a broadly self contained system of assumptions, theories and techniques in the Wealth of Nations (1961 p.51)<sup>lviii</sup>. The Kantian – Humean roots of classical economics are evident in its commitment to individualism despite its recognition of distinct social classes. Society was seen as being based on an economic – not on political or religious-foundations. In Smith for example the mode of subsistence is regarded as the determinant of moral sentiments, forms of government and social institutions. The division of labour is the mechanism through which society evolves through four stages, hunting, pastorage, agriculture and commerce. The state is an instrument for the promotion / protection of the moral sentiments and the property form appropriate to a particular mode of subsistence (Meek 1976). The moral order is strictly subordinate to the economic order a means for ensuring the later's reproduction. In Smith's "commercial society" the primary rule of the state is to secure human rights and to promote the marketization of social relations<sup>lix</sup>. Such a society is sustained by human nature – "the propensity to truck, barter and exchange" – but requires the protection of a liberal state. While the pursuit of self interest creates a powerful impetus for the material progress of society, social harmony is based on the technological dependence of the three great classes – labourers, landowners and "owners of stock" (capitalists) – for the furtherance of the division of labour and the expansion of the market. All classes benefit from and therefore support accumulation. Accelerating the rate of accumulation is thus a requirement of social justice which the liberal state can ensure by promoting universal self interestedness. Self oriented individuation and social harmony are thus seen as mutually reinforcing tendencies in capitalist society. Social harmony requires that the individual be oriented to the pursuit of his self interest and capitalist society is justified on the grounds of material progress. Protecting the

natural and inalienable right of capitalist property is thus an essential element in the construction of a just order.

Ricardo completed Smith's system by formally basing economic analysis on the labour theory of value which equates the value of a commodity with the labour time used up in its production. This labour theory of value also provides the basis for Locke's justification of human rights and of representative democracy<sup>lx</sup>. The value concept is thus emptied of its moral content and firmly grounded on a materialized basis. The concept of a just price becomes meaningless and capitalist justice is merely equating costs and revenues (allowing for normal profits). Capitalist society was theorized as resting on a rationalist, naturalist base and interference with the market on the basis of moral prohibitions and injunctions (halal and haram) were delegitimized. The legislative proposals put forward by the classical economists were thus based on class interests<sup>lxi</sup> and not as moral considerations – Smith and Ricardo's only "moral" commitment was to the growth of capital, which was explicitly seen as an end in itself.

Modern economic analysis begins with the abstract alienated individual who uses his reason to maximize his consumption or his profit. He finds himself "thrown" (in a Heideggerian sense) into a system of relationships with other individuals who manifest the same behavior patterns. Economics never asks: where did this system come from? Production and exchange are seen as strictly technical processes and their 'moral' content – the commitment to self interest and the trivialization of moral concerns – is deliberately concealed. Thus the social relations of capitalism are presented as natural and the formal expressions of human rationality – rationality is dedicated to the fulfillment of self interest and it is unnatural / irrational to use rationality for achieving any other ends. Self interest commits the (abstract) individual to accumulation / freedom – i.e. to a continuous never ending amassment of means for realizing one's ends. All ends are devoid of moral content and hence trivial for as Kant teaches the self cannot be known nor its ends evaluated except on the basis of the universalisability criterion. Accumulation is therefore the only end in itself in capitalist order and necessarily becomes the basis for ascribing value to all practices.

Economics sees the individual as free in two fundamental senses. First he possesses capitalist property<sup>lxii</sup>. Secondly he must be free of all moral constraints. Constitutional arrangements and legal regulation are means for expanding the individual's realm of freedom. Law and the constitution are thus means for subjugating the individual to capitalist property (most essentially his body and its desires) and freeing him from morality. Expanding the realm of freedom requires the organization of production and exchange on the basis of the circulation of capitalist money – money dedicated to accumulation and registering the exchange value of practices in terms approximate to their contribution to accumulation. Capitalist money possesses the power of self expansion – that is why interest is the life blood of capitalism (Maududi 1961 p74) and this is what distinguishes it from non capitalist money. Money takes the form of capital in the process of self expansion<sup>lxiii</sup> and self expansion of money becomes the purpose of the circulation of money among economic practices. Those who control the process of accumulation are not the owners but the agents of capital – the devils of avarice and covetousness are in possession of their souls. That is why managers – and not shareholders – control and organize production and exchange in capitalist society and as Meszaros (1995) shows even the wealthiest shareholder has no

power to defy/reject capitalist rationality – he must accept resource allocation in accordance with the need for capital accumulation or go bankrupt.

In capitalist society people are – in principle – equally free i.e. equally committed to the universalization of avarice and covetousness (takkathur). The history of Europe and America shows that practical freedom is capital accumulation. It is nothing else<sup>lxiv</sup>. Freedom is the possession/subjugation of man by capital (individually or collectively). Capitalist society remains harmonious (and can be reproduced) as long as individuals committed to the universalization of equal freedom (avarice and covetousness) remain legitimately dominant – either because most people are committed to equal freedom or because people holding non capitalist values do not have the power to legitimately challenge the capitalist elite. It is particularly important to realize that distributional struggles – struggles for example for the establishment of a welfare state sanctioned by Keynesianism or for communism – cannot transcend capitalism for they do not challenge the doctrine and practice of the universalizability of equal freedom (avarice and covetousness).

The capitalist elite recognizes the possibility of a systemic challenge based on value change<sup>lxv</sup> and a particular concern of traditional sociology has been to generate pro capitalistic solidaristic sentiments through secular education and encouragement of civil society institutions. Promoting liberal values has been a central project of social science and it is in this sense that Herbert Spenser called sociology ‘a moral science’ (1904 p88). But since the late 19<sup>th</sup> century economics has moved away from advocacy and this task has been monopolized by mainstream sociology. The dominant paradigm within economics during the last century and a quarter has been that of marginalism, pioneered by Jevons, Walras and Menger<sup>lxvi</sup>. The marginalists used a new method of economic analysis and applied the calculus to the determination of prices. They also rejected the possibility of the objective determination of exchange value by abandoning the labour theory of value. In the marginalist perception relative prices were determined by utility (not costs of production) and utility of commodities and practices was subjectively determined on the basis of preferences that marginalist economics took as given. Marginalism and modern economics base their claim of value neutrality on the grounds that they take preference as given and do not ostensibly adjudicate among them. Nevertheless modern economics is based on a quite specific theory of individuality and society and provides a materialistic justification for capitalist order. Economics is not a positive science in any sense. It is not a technology applicable to any end. It presumes the equal triviality of all ends and preference orderings. Without accepting this presupposition the claim that economic rationality enables the optimization of preference fulfillment is meaningless. This is so because economic rationality structures transactions to prioritize accumulation and such a society necessarily articulates a preference for preference itself. The dominance of the preference for preference negates all other value claims and the market, through its rationality, colonizes both individual being and the whole of the life of society.

Modern economics has Kantian roots. It insists on a rigorous separation of facts and values but advocates freedom (avarice and covetousness) and accumulation as an end in itself disguised as a means for the satisfaction of ends. Maximization of freedom is garbed in the robes of optimum allocation of resources for the elimination of scarcity and policy prescriptions (specially concerning the extent and form of government intervention) are derived for achieving this end. Capitalist rationality and capitalist

institutions are justified on this basis. Economics argues that capitalist institutions are natural and secure the general interest. Economics assumes that every rational individual is committed to the maximization of freedom (avarice and covetousness). Economic rationality seeks to show how this can be achieved in an ideal world characterized by perfect knowledge, perfect foresight, pure rationality and perfect competition. Economics is not concerned with showing how prices are determined in any actually existing capitalism but in evaluating actually existing capitalism on the basis of its ideal of pure rationality (i.e. total and unreserved commitment to the maximization of freedom). It is this unreserved commitment to freedom maximization which makes scarcity the central problem which economics addresses. Only scarce goods have exchange value – since air is not scarce, its marginal unit has no value. Economics assumes that Everyman seeks to escape scarcity and maximize utility.

In seeking utility maximization within the market each individual is faced with given exchange ratios (prices). To maximize utility the relative marginal utilities of goods possessed by the individual must correspond to the prices (exchange ratios) in which they stand. Under conditions of perfect rationality and perfect competition it can be shown that the prices which prevail will clear all markets. These prices will correspond to the free and rational choices of all individual members of society seeking utility (freedom) maximization in conditions of scarcity.

Economics thus abstracts both from the process of preference formation and the process of production. Given preferences and given production technology (which in this perspective alone determine production relations) rational (utility/profit maximizing) individuals make the optimum use of resources under conditions of scarcity. Prices of production services ('factors' of production) are determined in a manner analogous to the determination of the prices of commodities – i.e. on the basis of correspondence of the marginal contribution of each 'factor' of production to the final utility generated in the production process. Return to 'capital', labour and land are thus shown to correspond to their respective contribution to utility as estimated by the subjectively determined preferences of utility maximizing consumers. Assuming perfect knowledge, foresight, rationality (i.e. utility / profit maximizing behaviour) and competition factor markets can also be shown to clear (i.e. eliminate excess supply and demand).

As these are abstract models they necessarily ignore historical specifics. They are not positive as they merely assume and cannot justify utility/profit maximization. They provide justification for the existence of capitalist property, capitalist money and capitalist markets on the basis of the presumed necessity / durability of utility / profit maximization<sup>lxvii</sup>. These institutions are required for both structuring social decisions on the basis of utility maximization and for the estimation of utility in outcomes of individual practices. Within this framework the prices that arise are a consequence of the spontaneous and unconstrained expressions of capitalist rationality – a rationality committed to utility/profit maximization. All institutions, of both the market and the state, can then be theorized as technical instruments enabling free utility and profit maximizing individuals to practise their economic rationality. Prices are thus optimal in two senses. First they provide rational opportunities for calculating utility outcomes of utility/profit maximizing practices. Secondly they permit technically efficient social institutionalization at the level of the market and the state. "Distorting" prices frustrates utility maximizing decisions of autonomous individuals. It is both technically inefficient (in that it reduces

aggregate utility/profit maximization) and unjust. Such “distortion” may however be justified on two grounds.

- Competition in the market is not perfect and intervention is necessary to reduce monopoly. Here prices are being “corrected” to approach competitive levels
- The initial endowments on the basis of which free utility/profit maximizing individuals enter the markets are such that some individuals can influence the process of price formation. Intervention is then justified on grounds of correcting inequality.

Social democratic and communist regimes (China) justify interventions on the basis of such considerations. They therefore do not achieve a transcendence of capitalism – although both social democratic and communist regimes do constrain (but do not in principle negate) human rights<sup>lxviii</sup>. Social democracy and communism objects to marginalism’s separation of the analysis of the pricing of “factors of production” from its analysis of the efficiency and equity of the (initial) distribution of endowments and for treating the distributive shares of ‘capital’ and labour in the social product as natural categories. But they do not object to the capitalist ideal of a society which offers the most perfect expression of the preferences of the rational (utility/profit maximizing) members of that society – that is why the incumbent Chinese leadership can continue to laud the “socialist market economy”. The essential affinity between orthodox economists and their social democrat (including Keynesian) and communist critics is that both propose measures for reducing monopoly and enhancing equality within the context of a freedom maximizing society. Thus the neo classical economist Frederich Von Wieser<sup>lxix</sup> advocated encouragement of trade unionism, worker protective legislation, compulsory insurance, housing subsidies, control of speculation, land reform and establishment of state and municipal enterprises as necessary reforms for correcting power distributional inequalities generated by capitalist order (1927).

Also both orthodox economists and their social democrat and communist critics recognize the manager as the most efficient representative of capital and ultimate controller of capitalist property – that is why in liberal social democratic and communist organization the worker’s subordination to management has always been accepted as legitimate.

Social democratic and communist practices change form not the content of capitalist property. In both liberal and communist manifestations of the capitalist system private property is abolished. Control of capitalist property has necessarily to be vested in the representative of capital, state enterprises or corporate managers. Legal owners of capitalist property – whether shareholders or citizens of communist countries – do not have the power to resist capitalist rationality and hence concentration (of authority and information) cannot be restricted without reducing capital accumulation. Capitalist society – whether liberal or communist – is necessarily fractured into an increasing mass of powerless people and a decreasing elite of more and more powerful controllers. Subordination of the powerless to the powerful is maintained essentially through labour market relationships and growth in inequalities is a means for sustaining the scarcity without which utility/profit maximizing rationality would loose its *raison d’etre*. The capitalist system produces abundance in the form of overproduction of agricultural

goods and manufactures waste, obsolete equipment and technology and increased masses of unemployed and pensioned citizens. But for the capitalist system to be sustainable men must not recognize this abundance. They must be obsessed by avarice and covetousness. They must want more, and more than others. Capital is the concrete form of freedom – insatiable avarice and limitless covetousness. While consumption of cars, computers, rice and haircuts is necessarily limited there is no limit to the accumulation of pure quantity in the form of financial assets. Capitalist rationality perpetuates scarcity in that those subject to capitalist order always need more capital. Capitalist institutions – in the market and the state are not spontaneous or natural unintended consequences of human behaviour. They are specifically designed to sustain and promote the universalization of avarice and covetousness. These vices must possess human bodies, societies and states for the continuing reproduction of capitalist order.

Capitalist rationality – the universal dominance of avarice and covetousness – has to be constructed. It can come to dominate man's being in the world only in specific circumstances. Capitalist rationality thus describes man's potential for becoming what he ought to be according to Kantian and utilitarian philosophers. It is in this sense that capitalism has a history – a sequence of epistemological, social and political interventions through which man is shown his "natural" potential and taught and enabled to practise avarice and covetousness. In the Enlightenment and the Romantic traditions the crucial epistemological transformation is the replacement of abdiyat by freedom as man's fundamental conviction. Capitalist man is irrevocably committed to freedom and the repudiation of Allah's sovereignty. Unreserved commitment to avarice and covetousness require a prior commitment to man's autonomy and equality (the two necessary attributes of freedom).

Constructing capitalist individuality is the central project of modernist and post modernist philosophy and aesthetics (Rizvi 2002). It is necessarily a project which requires the delegitimation of religion's ontological accounts of being and of the world. The construction of capitalist individuality requires the construction of capitalist markets and capitalist states. Capitalist markets invariably emerge from non capitalist social formations – this is true even of the United States where for example Jaynes (1986) has documented the legislative acts and policy measures adopted to create a labour market after the abolition of slavery in the decades after the civil war. The US government after 1865 enforced a legal political system that effectively disenfranchised the blacks, reduced their economic power and shaped the labour market. There was thus little "spontaneity" in the development of capital labour relations in the America South in the second half of the nineteenth century. Today legislative and policy making measures adopted by the World Trade Organization are similarly constructing technology markets by universalizing the US patent system. Once again there is nothing spontaneous or automatic about the processes of legitimization which reduce the access of developing countries to the new technologies.

Capitalist markets and capitalist property forms are thus historical constructions in the specific sense that capitalist laws and practices are required for their emergence and their sustenance. Outcomes of course need not have been as intended but a certain easily definable ethos motivated the actions which led to the development of capitalist property. These markets are premised on the existence of ideologically sanctioned property rights – rights about ownership, exchange and unrequited transfer with respect to human bodies, life forms, water, land and artifacts. Similarly, a property-defining

authority must be ideologically sanctioned. Since such sanctioning requires an exercise of political power, the state necessarily plays a major role in defining and enforcing the legitimization of a particular conception of property rights.

Capitalist markets structure price-based decision-making between anonymous individuals. Social positions do not define exchange relationships. Non capitalist exchange is contextualised by a set of rules and traditions which restrict the scope for price based choices. Similarly, exchanges between citizen and government of even the most mature capitalist state in history do not constitute a market relationship because a citizen cannot directly choose the services he receives or the taxes he pays to government. Non-market exchanges are, however, increasingly exceptional in capitalist (civil) societies and price-based exchange among anonymous buyers and sellers usually dominate. Market relations are the main determinant of the pace and pattern of economic activity.

Capitalist states like capitalist society (“civil society”) are historical constructs. Their primary purpose is the continued reproduction of capitalist property and its associated relationships. This is achieved through a “regime of accumulation”. Today the global regime of accumulation requires the construction of a capitalist state, which can legitimize.

- (a) The subordination of national public transport, energy, communication, and financial sectors to global capital.
- (b) The marketization of public sector wage contracts.
- (c) The determination of wage levels within processes of international competition leading to a widening of wage differentials in national economies.
- (d) Enhanced systemic mobility of capital (but not of labour since there is no relaxation of immigration controls at the global level).
- (e) Abandonment of full employment as a goal of macroeconomic policy.
- (f) Abandonment of state regulation of financial markets and increased dependence on foreign financial flows.
- (g) Higher financial returns in both capital and money markets.
- (h) The dominance of financial markets – and therefore of national economies-by non-bank financial intermediaries, which specialize in dividing risk associated with market finance into their elementary components and making them negotiable. Risk sales of this sort have led to the emergence of colossal markets in global liquidity. States increasingly articulate accommodative macro strategies to fall in line with the preferences of these new global financial giants.
- (i) The growth of individualism and the weakening of collective expression of individual aspirations.
- (j) The new compartmentalization of the work process associated with the increased application of information technology.



Neo liberalism both justifies and provides a governance technology for this “Post Fordist” regime of accumulation. Since the late 1970s, there have been several important methodological advances in mainstream theory and as Fine puts it “the political is being put back into economic analysis” (1997 p. 145), through for example segmented labour market theory and analysis of rent seeking behaviour. But such broadening of scope does not amount to a departure from methodological individualism. The “givenness” of preferences and the compulsion to maximize are retained as assumptions underlying the analysis of household behaviour, educational choice and trade union action. Methodological individualism now occupies those sub-disciplines (development, urban and labour economics for example) from which it was previously (partially) excluded. The state itself is viewed as an individual with given preferential trade offs between potential policy outcomes. Institutional economics (in particular) has also developed theories explaining the collective behaviour of optimizing agents. Both the new political economy and institutional economics represent a major advance in colonization of other social sciences (industrial relations, law, sociology and multi disciplinary approaches such as analytical Marxism).

Endogenous growth theory has also sought to open up the black box of the technological residual in a typical Solow-Dennison type production function. This has partially legitimized “capacity building” policy initiatives at the micro and macro levels – without calling into question the relevance of rational expectations “in the last instance”. The emphasis laid on the role of human capital (Lucas 1988), producer durables and “ideas” (Roemer 1996) creates a possibility of going beyond equilibrium analysis and developing a deeper understanding of (optimizing) choices. But the policy prescriptions of endogenous growth theory have not been validated by empirical evidence. As Ruttan argues, why “capability building is more successful in specific cases is not adequately explained by endogenous growth theory. It does not have the capacity to reach behind the “proximate” causes of growth and understand “pre-conditions “and “take off” stages (or processes)” (1998 p. 24-25). Ruttan seems to believe that by modifying assumptions (regarding for example homothetic preferences and neutral technical change) and “adding on” variables such as changes in the structure of production, demographic transition patterns, environmental constraints etc. these weaknesses could be addressed. But it is the commitment to methodological individualism (commitment to the “givenness” of preferences and the “ununiversality” of optimizing behaviour) which is the primary dominant constraint on indigenous growth theory’s ability to understand capitalist process. This theory – like all other manifestations of the “new” economics – accepts as unproblematic the “universal permanent” character of capitalist expectations, markets and governance processes. It is thus inevitable that it can say little about possibilities/strategies for ensuring or undermining the continued universal, permanence of capitalist order.

Economic theory’s commitment to the non-problematized universal permanence of capitalist order is reflected in its commitment to a premise of homogeneity. Economics is inspired by liberal political thought and aspires to describe a “pure” economy governed ultimately by Natural Law (Keat 1993). In this perspective, Riffat is committed to a supposed universal rationality (optimizing discounted consumption flows over a finite lifetime). Commitment to such rationality and the added assumption of competitive equilibrium also implies Riffat’s awareness of the (total) web of (human and natural) relationships which structure/constrain her use of resources. In this sense a general equilibrium system

is completely centralized in that the characteristics of the system are in the minds of all interacting individuals and they all effectively behave as a single individual (Riffat is alone in her own empty universe). This commitment to homogeneity necessarily rules out the possibility of policy effectiveness – as rational expectations based models have so often demonstrated.

Actually existing capitalism (in all its historical states) is characterized by both heterogeneity and coherence. Riffat's behavior is often "irrational" (non-optimizing and or based on imperfect information). Yet, there is sustainable coherence of behavior patterns reflected in the normal practices of markets and states. Economics explains this coherence by attempts to identify the microeconomic foundations of the macroeconomy the macroeconomy is treated effectively as an aggregated microeconomy. "Adding up" micro level outcomes and systematically ignoring relational complexities at and between economic levels is seen as unproblematic by (at least) neo classical economics.

Twenty first century capitalism is likely to be characterized by increased heterogeneity. Differential access to information creates asymmetries of influence and power. Moreover, increased externalities are also limiting the homogenization effects of market allocative processes. Externalities blur the distinction between public and private goods and prioritize collective (co-operative) over competitive action. Thus, market equilibrium systems cannot be used to describe (macro) economies in cases where externalities significantly influence distributional processes. Competitive equilibrium cannot exist in a world characterized by significant informational asymmetries and externalities – in such a world competitive behavior may be disadvantageous from the perspective of (even) self interested individuals and the policy coordinating role of markets may therefore be limited.

In capitalist order money is the primordial link between individuals – it is the key to membership of capitalist society and the medium for the legitimate settlement of obligations incurred in the pursuit of differentiated individual ends – coherence in capitalist society is ensured by the universal commitment to settle debts in the form of money. Money value of income may make the settlement of obligations impossible even over a life time and the mismatch of payment ability and payment obligations (both measured in money) creates the possibility of crises. Capitalism is essentially a monetary system. Power is expressed in the ability of capital's managers to create and circulate money in a form, which permits accumulation. Economic value is the relative assessment expressed in money terms of each individual economic act by capitalist society. These assessments reflect the act's contribution (direct or indirect) to accumulation. In non-capitalist society, assignment of value reflects adherence to transcendental moral conceptions (Christian, Islamic) or to a trans-historical conception of human needs. Capitalism defines such norms with reference to accumulation alone. The achievement of the maximum satisfaction of needs (maximization of aggregate utility) and of its associated justices is seen to be a consequence of efficient accumulation alone. Money thus becomes the symbol of the sovereignty of a citizen who believes in capitalism's norms and it is the adherence to these norms which necessarily sub-ordinates the capitalist state to capitalist civil society.

Since money is the basis of capitalist order accumulation of capital is the accumulation of power – the desire to accumulate money/power infinitely is universally dominant in capitalist order. The movement

of money capital determines the division of labour, structures the employer – employee relationship and dominates both “capitalists” and “labourers”. This dominance of money capital is a pre-requisite for assigning relative value to economic activities in accordance with their (relative) contribution to accumulation. Capitalist order thus requires:

- a. Universal dominance of the desire to accumulate capitalist money/power
- b. Continued expectation of increased access to capitalist money/power.

Subordination to the desire to accumulate takes place most formally at the level of the enterprise: this subordination has a collective character. Collectively labourers are subordinated to the authority of managers – individually Riffat is free to pursue private ends and work for whom she chooses. Collectively managers are dependent on consumers. Individually they are free to compete. Accumulation necessitates the systematic taking of risks to bring about structural changes in the division of labour. Investment risks cannot be taken without the enhancement of indebtedness – hence the universality of the continual buying and selling of debts and rights to capital use and the evaluation of these claims in financial markets within capitalist order. These evaluations are speculations on the future. Doubts about solvency of risk takers and their financiers may lead to major changes in financial evaluations by firms, banks and macro economic managers. Hence sustaining capitalist orders also requires.

- c. Efficient mediation to ensure compatibility between financial claims and obligations for continuing accumulation.

Policy is required to ensure the continued existence of (a) (b) and (c). Capitalist order is not spontaneously generated in the spheres of production and finance or within the social sphere, and it is not self-perpetuating – hence the possibility of crises emerging from the non-realization of (a) and/or (b) and / or (c). Policy may be regarded as successful if it strengthens the social dominance of the desire to accumulate money/power, facilitates such accumulation by dominant individuals in different social groups and articulates an effective debt management strategy. Policy is a means for linking different segments of the micro-economy within the context of a particular macroeconomic coherence. In capitalism enterprises (firms and banks) are important co-ordinating links between the micro and macro economy. The enterprise structures rules of payments, flows of goods and financial relationships into a hierarchy relating stake holders with claims/obligations on the collectively produced added values. These structures are created by collective – and therefore necessarily political – actions. The political nature of the mediation process is a reflection of the underlying tension between the continuing need to accumulate and the continuing need to legitimate particular forms of accumulation. The maintenance of social cohesion requires this continuing legitimization and it usually takes the form of democratization of decision making processes at the inter enterprise level.

In the twentieth century, successful mediation has taken the form of the creation of a high wage society. this has often entailed rising fiscal costs but has given collective purpose to the pursuit of private

interests. In twentieth century capitalism of the “Butskellist” variety subordination at the level of production of the individual worker was legitimized by the provision of collective rights. This form of mediation was established not spontaneously but through continuing political negotiations between the representatives of capitalists and labourers. This was “Fordism”.

Breakdown of a mediation regime, (say Fordism) may be interpreted as the consequence of a breakdown of interactions between mediation mechanisms which are concerned with balancing divergent aspects of regimes of accumulation. Thus, Fordist organization facilitated both security and (limited) mobility. It was compatible with pluralist order, which has space for personal autonomy. But tensions are necessarily involved in managing autonomy and subordination and the possibility of the emergence of a recurrent sub-optimal equilibrium (recession) or disequilibrium (crisis) cannot be ruled out.

The literature attributes several reasons for the breakdown of Fordist order (Lash and Urry 1987, Hirst and Thompson 1997, Agleitta 1999). These include (a) globalization of production and financing systems (b) changes in production and exchange technology (c) deproletarianisation of the labour class and (d) atomization of social life (and destruction of communities) specially in the OECD countries. “Post Fordist” order is characterized by growing full time unemployment, increased maldistribution of income (specially in the United States) the spread of consumerism to many third world countries, the growth of part time employment, cheapening of the cost of financial and technological transfer across national frontiers, widening of differentials in inter sectoral productivity growth rates and changes in demographic structures.

Effective mediation processes are required for sustaining “post Fordism” – it is not a self sustaining order. Fordist mediation structures are collapsing but in Europe at least social rights remains a constituent element of citizenship – though political commitment to these collective rights is weakening. Similarly, mediation within the work process continues with collective bargaining being replaced by human resource management. As monopolistic competition increases organizational changes in firms and state bureaucratic decision making structures facilitate outsourcing, “automation” and the growth of “flexible specialization”. All these are mediated, not spontaneous, responses. A new compatibility between the accumulation regime and the social commitment to capital’s hegemony is being created and needs to be sustained.

It is important to stress however that post Fordism – like all other phases of capitalism – is a political choice. The political forces sustaining financial liberalization have been identified. International financial liberalization has been an explicit political choice of the metropolitan states. Capital account liberalization by the OECD governments is attributable to the growing political influence of international banks in the United States, Germany and Britain.

Under this political pressure advanced country governments, chose not to implement more effective capital controls when they had both the legal right and the technical expertise to do so. Financial

liberalization is a political not a technical imperative. States continue to have the technical resources to regulate capital markets but they choose not to do so for political reasons. Governments are not forced to liberalize for technical reasons but choose to do so because the political representatives of international finance dominate them.

In recent years, a large literature has been produced to show that capital controls retain high effectivity in present circumstances. The choice not to use capital controls reflects a political willingness to bear the domestic costs of the international integration of financial markets. Thus Webb (1994) attributes the greater financial instability of the 1980s and 1990s not to a decline of US hegemony but to increased international financial integration fostered by the policy support of the US government. In the post Bretton Woods period the financial power of the United States vis-à-vis other states has not declined. It has declined with respect to the international financial markets because the representatives of international finance have captured the US states and have become a systemically privileged force within it. As domestic political costs of adjusting to international financial market integration increase, policy co-ordination becomes a matter of imposing a larger proportion of such costs on the weaker open states – such as those of East and South Asia.

In this sense, international financial market integration increases the vulnerability of the weak states, which rely on forcing capital (Thailand, Malaysia, and Indonesia). Failure on the part of these states to subordinate their fiscal and monetary policies to those of the Western powers is heavily punished by the speculators dominating world financial markets.

Legitimizing post Fordism thus requires political mediation Post Fordism is characterized by (a) globalization of capital markets (b) a shrinking of the authority and the scope of state mediation processes (c) an increasing threat to collective identities. Symptoms of these structured imbalances are (a) persistent high unemployment in Europe (b) increased income/wealth related distribution inequality in America. (Mosley 1999) and (c) crisis and fundamental restructuring leading to subordination in advanced third world countries and stagnation in the rest. The growth of individualism, the globalization of capital markets and the retreat of the state has initiated a process for the destruction of Fordist mediation regimes which combined a degree of social insurance with rising accumulation by limiting labour market competition through collective bargaining and state subsidization of both investment and labour markets. A new structure of mediation seems required to reconcile the need for accumulation and social cohesion. Capitalist order must continue to provide (at least the prospects for) a high and rising real wage for its typical citizen.

Whether it can do so depends on the nature of the transition from Fordism. This leads to the question whether the capitalist system as a whole (and not just some of its constituent parts) is experiencing or is likely to experience a “crisis”. Post Marxist analysts – and – others continue to argue that capitalism has been experiencing a secular downturn since the break down of Fordism. This is so even for the United States where as Mosley (1999) shows during 1965-1997 productivity growth has slowed down to 1 percent per annum (as against two per cent per annum during 1950-65) and average real wages have fallen by 15 percent. The downturn since 1965 has been quite unexpected – thus Herman Kahn had

expected US average real wages to triple by 2000. Moreover, there has been stagnation in profits measured as a proportion of net capital stock. This ratio equaled 15 percent in 1994 as in 1970 – thus the increase in profits since 1980 has merely led to a making up of the ground “lost” during the 1970s when wages had risen sharply. In 1948 the profits to net capital stock ratio stood at 22 percent: The breakdown of the high wage society is also reflected in the rise in the percentage of workers in low paid jobs – up from 23 percent in 1973 to 31 percent in 1996 (Mishel 1997 p136). Living standards have been maintained by a massive growth of personal debt – this has grown from 70% of annual personal income in 1975 to 100 percent in 1996 (Mishel 1997 p147). Heavily indebted people are very vulnerable to economic downturn and increase in interest rates. The introduction of the new information related technology has not significantly raised productivity or profits in the United States. There is therefore no likelihood that the low wage strategy will be abandoned in the near future (Mosley 1999).

The relatively better growth performance of the US during the 1990s (now hotly disputed by economists such as Krugman and Brenner) is explained by the increase in foreign capital inflow – these rose from \$56 billion in 1993 to over \$260 billion in 1997 and represented one fourth of total private investment in the United States in that year. This accelerated inflow allowed the US to reduce government deficits and stimulated growth. It also led to a substantial increase in stock market prices and had a pronounced wealth effect in sustaining high consumption levels. But increased dependence on foreign capital has created problems – an inability by Asian banks to settle their rescheduled debt commitments can lead to significant falls in US stock values and rises in interest rates – and this will have a serious impact on a larger proportion of US householders – those who finance consumption by borrowing and those with significant investment on the capital markets. A recession in the United States is thus not improbable in the present decade.

The 1980s, 1990s and the first half of the present decade have seen a protracted recession in Africa and several crisis (followed by recession) in Latin America and East Asia. The mainstream (World Bank inspired) literature attributes this to “cronyism” and lack of good governance which is defined as a political mismanagement of economic decision making processes (Keily 1998). While being forced to acknowledge the existence of periodic crisis in several parts of the Third World the conventional literature can offer no coherent strategy for creating a new set of mediation mechanisms to deal with the type of problems associated with the decline of Fordism. Instead IMF reform programs implemented in East Asia represented an orthodox dismantling of Fordist policy – market constraining institutional arrangements of a type that are common in Europe were explicitly targeted by the IMF and the pace of disbursement was deliberately slowed down to force compliance with policy dismantling conditionalities. IMF policies were heavily criticized by even usually sympathetic commentators (Dornbusch 1994). Subsequent revisions incorporated no innovations however but a mere slowing down of Fordist policy dismantling. This enabled many Asian countries to pursue mild expansionist policies and make use of capital controls. The IMF however continues to argue for speeded up liberalization and enjoys strong US support for these initiatives. Amendment to the Fund’s articles of agreement is being sponsored by the US to enable the IMF to mandate capital accounts convertibility for all its members. This will significantly enhance the IMF’s systemic power and reduce state capacities to articulate national mediation initiatives for sustaining post Fordist accumulation regimes. There is however no evidence that removing capital controls stimulates accumulation or addresses any of the other typical imbalances of a post Fordist mediation regime (Rodrik 1998).

Capitalism today is experiencing systemic transition. This transition is reflected in changes such as the increased international dependence of the world's only rogue super power and the set backs suffered by capitalism's most dynamic economies in East Asia. Slow down in world economic growth has persisted since the mid 1970s and there are no signs of a major upturn in the OECD economies. Several authors have identified what they consider to be the major structural causes underlying this protracted downturn. Thus Brenner (1998) argues that over capacity and over production in manufacturing has led to a secular decline in profits and in the rate of accumulation. Restructuring of manufacturing involving a reduction of excess capacity and elimination of obsolete technology is resisted by the old monopolists who dominate these branches and systematically obstruct new entrants. Hence gains from economies of scale and scope cannot be realized. Falling profits are a consequence not of rising wages but of inter capitalist competition. Policies which break up the old monopolies and increase the power of new entrant latest technology utilizing capital are required to stimulate growth. In the absence of such policy, there is co-ordination failures for while not investing is optimal for a firm (due to over capacity) investment leading to restructuring is optimal from the point of view of the macroeconomy.

Capitalist crisis may be understood as a short, sharp turn around in the business cycle. It involves widespread bankruptcies, bank failures, shooting up of interest rates; collapsing exchange rates and monetary panics. Recessions on the other hand are long drawn phases of persistent high levels of unemployment and low or negative output growth. System wide crisis have become uncommon since the late 19<sup>th</sup> century but capitalism has witnessed several recessions in the twentieth century – national crisis on the other hand have been common in Latin America, East Asia and sub-Saharan Africa. Recessions are mediated through credit chains linking domestic economic sectors and the national economy to world financial markets. Recessions have the potential to change the course of capitalism's historical development. But neither crisis nor recession are sufficient causes of transition from capitalism – such a transition requires a comprehensive break down of capitalist order specially its political mediation processes and a wholesale man rejection of capitalist values, avarice and competition.

Crisis are triggered by speculation. Scope for speculation within a capitalist economy is created by the link between the credit (trade and banking) system and the accumulation regime. Inter-linkages between credit claims (usually of a speculative nature) ensure increased danger of an escalation of bankruptcies in mature financial systems. During crisis, there is a rapid switch from credit to monetary assets: This triggers the bankruptcies of many financially viable firms. It is in this sense that a capitalist crisis is necessarily a monetary phenomenon involving a collapse of credit.

The institutional financial structure is thus very important in the determination of the intensity and duration of crisis and recession. In 'main banking' financial system (such as Japan) cross shareholding makes mergers and acquisitions (M and A) difficult and facilitate long term commitment of bank capital to industry. In recession, such banks are willing to tolerate long periods of non-payment of interest. In the US such bank tolerance of interest nonpayment is unheard of and there is swift capital restructuring through M and A. In the main banking system, industrial and financial policy are inter-linked and the state plays an explicitly counter-cyclical "governance" role. In Anglo-Saxon financial systems on the

other hand, state institutions are essentially lenders of the last resort. Internationalization of financial markets must involve the creation of a new financial “architecture” which subordinates national financial governance regimes – during the 1990s this has involved universalization of financial liberalization practice but while financial efficiency has increased world wide manufacturing productivity growth has stagnated – even in the United States (Mosley 1999). Financial sector growth has not been accompanied by increased accumulation in world industry. Industry has lost the role of capital’s primary source of accumulation that it occupied in the most advanced countries since the decline of agriculture – and specially in the Fordist era (Kay 1975). Now much financial surplus generated in industry is channeled into speculation and other investments on the financial markets. Liberalized finance capital has asserted a new found autonomy vis-à-vis both the nation state and world industry. This is surely a major watershed in capitalism’s history.

Finance capital prefers growth restrictionist (“conservative”) policies and this inhibits industrial restructuring. Thus, an important policy concern for capitalism’s managers must be to reconcile financial liberalization with the need to maintain industrial sector dynamism. Modern economic theory’s new found concern with strategic behaviour, informational asymmetries and co-ordination failure retain its commitment to methodological individualism. Its foolish search for the microeconomic roots of the macroeconomy severely limits its ability to understand the mediation processes which serve the purpose of reconciling hetromonious behavior patterns and preferences within the context of a deliberately created and precariously sustained coherent accumulation regime.

Economics, as a discipline, is increasingly ineffective in legitimating the practices of actually existing capitalisms – its usefulness as a source of appropriate capitalist governance technology is also limited. Institutions such as the IMF the World Bank and the WTO and central banks and national finance ministries do however draw upon, economics as a source of regulatory practices for maintaining national and imperialist capitalist order. As we argue in chapter 4 economics methodology cannot be used to legitimate or govern a non capitalist order. The Islamic economists attempt to articulate Islamic policy on the basis of theorization within the economics paradigm leads to a subordination of Islamic norms, regulation procedures and transaction forms to capitalist order. It cannot lead to a transcendence of capitalism.

#### **Summary: Economics and Capitalism**

- Economics first appears in the thought of French and Scottish. Enlightenment thinkers of the 18<sup>th</sup> century.
- Economics’ Kantian – Humean roots are evident in its commitment to methodological individualism.
- Economists regards society as being based on material foundations, production and subsistence, – not on political or religious grounds. In Smith the modes of subsistence determine moral sentiments and forms of governance.



- Each 'mode of subsistence' requires a specific set of moral sentiments and the state must promote this and its associated property form. In Smith's 'commercial society' the primary role of the state is to promote human rights and the marketization of society.
- Capitalist order is justified on naturalistic grounds – it is based on human nature, social harmony is based on the technological mutual interdependence of the three classes, in the classical perspective. All classes benefit from the expansion of the division of labour and accumulation. Accelerating accumulation is a requirement of social justice.
- According to the classical / neo classical perspective self interested individuation and social harmony are mutually reinforcing tendencies. Capitalist property is seen as the terrain for reconciling the particular (individualist) and the general interest through accumulation.
- The naturalistic justification for capitalist property is provided by the labour theory of value. The body is seen as the primary instrument dedicated to accumulation.
- When value is based on labour time it is emptied of any moral content and based on materialist foundations: Capitalist society is seen as based on a naturalistic/materialist basis and interfering with price formation is seen as interfering with nature. Restricting economic practices through halal/haram injunctions is thus unjust.
- The only legitimate objective is accumulation for its own sake.
- Economic analysis begins with the isolated individual who dedicates his rationality to accumulation. Production and exchange are seen as technical processes.
- Man is naturally immoral (all ends of accumulation are trivial) and capitalist social institutions are free expressions of human immoral rationality. Accumulation is the only end in capitalism and necessarily becomes the basis for ascribing value to all economic practices.
- Economics sees the individual as free since (a) he possesses capitalist property (b) he is not subject to external moral constraints. Capitalist regulation subjects the individual to freedom (accumulation) and therefore to capitalist property. It frees him from morality.
- Domination of society by accumulation is dominance by finance and capitalist money – self expanding money. The contribution of a practice to the self expansion of money determines its value. As long as such value determination remains legitimate capitalist order can be self sustaining.
- Capitalism is threatened not by distributional struggles (social democracy) or struggles for possession of capitalist property (communism) but by value change. Generating pro capitalist solidarity has been the central concern of mainstream sociology.
- The dominant economics paradigm since the late 19<sup>th</sup> century – marginalism – justifies liberal values by the use of a new methodology. Here value is determined not by labour time incorporated in a commodity but by its utility – its ability to satisfy preferences of consumers. The marginalists took

preferences as given. Marginalists do not adjudicate among preference. They justify the preference for preference itself.

- Economics seeks the maximization of the satisfaction of preferences in conditions of scarcity. The optimum / most efficient pattern of resource allocation is that which achieves this end.
- Economics sees capitalist institutions as natural technical means for facilitating the maximization of freedom / output. In an ideal world of perfect knowledge and perfect competition capitalist institutions need no regulation.
- Actual outcomes are measured with reference to the ideal world of perfect competition / knowledge. Policies are advocated to move the actual to the ideal world.
- Scarcity is the central problem of economics because of its unreserved commitment to freedom maximization.
- Prices in markets characterized by perfect competition and perfect rationality reflect the free choices of all individuals in condition of scarcity. Because of this markets will clear.
- Economics does not ask (a) what are the right preferences (b) where does production technology come from.
- Pricing in factor markets is analogous to pricing in goods markets – determined by the contribution of each factor of production to utility.
- For capitalist markets to function both capitalist money and capitalist property must exist. Capitalist property and capitalist money are seen as natural / technical and all institutions supporting capitalist property and money are also natural / technical means for enabling individuals to make free choices.
- Distorting prices frustrates utility maximization. This is both inefficient and unjust.
- Social democrats and communists justify intervention in markets on grounds of efficiency and distribution both related to monopoly.
- Social democracy/communism does not transcend capitalism because it endorses freedom despite rejecting individuation. Socialist reforms are means for maximizing freedom and individual preferences are seen as distorting resource allocation patterns.
- Both liberals and communists recognize managers as representatives of capital. Both endorse capitalist property and worker subjugation. Both liberal and communist capitalism abolishes private property.
- Capitalist rationality is imposed on the people. Both liberal and communist capitalist societies are fractured into the powerless and the controllers.

- Subordination is maintained through the labour and financial markets and increasing relative poverty is a means for sustaining the inequality without which freedom loses meaning.
- Capitalism produces abundance of commodities and leisure. But for capital (avarice/covetousness) to exist abundance should not be recognized and every one should want more and more than others. This means dominance of financial markets.
- This requires creation/regulation of specific institutions which can universalise avarice/covetousness. Capitalist rationality has to be socially constructed. Capitalist order teaches man to seek freedom reject abdiyat.
- Capitalist markets are created by capitalist states – WTO is creating a world technology market – through capitalist law and regulation. Capitalist law transforms the whole of society into a market. It universalizes the wage form and sanctions the value determining role of the financial market.
- Regulation has to be historically specific and that is why (a)capitalism evolves (b) there are many capitalisms.
- Post Fordist (globalized) regulatory regime must legitimize.
  - × dominance of energy, communication and finance by global capital.
  - × international market determination of wage contracts
  - × abandonment of national financial sovereignty
  - × marketization of technology flows
  - × individualization of work form from collective bargaining to HRM
- Recent developments in economic theory and policy seek to do this but their success in legitimating and providing an appropriate governance technology for capitalism remains limited.

### 3.3. Political Science

Both sociology and political science are concerned with the legitimation of capitalist order. Political science is concerned principally with state regulation, while sociology primarily addresses issues related to the regulation of capitalist society (civil society).

Political science originates in the work of the French encyclopedists of the eighteenth century<sup>lxx</sup>. Central to their work was a rejection of Christian metaphysics and a commitment to empiricism. Empiricism naturally focuses attention on this world and the world to come necessarily loses significance as a source of knowledge and value. Political science thus delegitimises claims based on divine authority. Human happiness in this world becomes the criterion establishing the efficacy and justice of political institutions. Political science is thus based on individualist and utilitarian prejudices<sup>lxxi</sup>. Political science is empiricist to the core – indeed it is in this sense that it claims to be a “science” (King et al 1994). It’s

value claims are supposedly grounded on empirical observation. Mainstream political science represented by the institutionalists is also inductionist – an empirical generalization on observation of particulars<sup>lxxii</sup>. It seeks the inductive discovery of regularities in the political world. Political science supposedly proceeds from the observation of facts to the generalization of hypotheses which when empirically verified observations yield, scientific laws on the basis of which explanations of past and predictions of future events can be made.

Even Popper (1971) recognizes that the inductive method is incapable of guaranteeing the validity of scientific knowledge – as we have seen Hume pointed this out in the 18<sup>th</sup> century. Empiricism can never establish necessary connections between events. Moreover observation is never passive – the observer imposes his presumptions upon the observed. All theories (including political science theories) are necessarily based on non observable phenomenon and propositions. Therefore the validation of the scientific method (and its application to political events) has to fall back upon. Popper's falsification criteria<sup>lxxiii</sup>. Currently Popperian conceptions of scientific method dominate political science. The Popperian methodology is committed to incrementalism and to problem solving. The Popperian approach is forced to admit that its commitment to pluralism entails an acceptance of relativism and an admission that there can be no rational justification of values. Popperian analysis takes political preferences as given and are often modeled upon the market studying the unintended consequences of a mass of separate actions and not on the intention of political actors. In post Popperian analysis there is a pragmatic switch from concern with truth to a concern with 'what works'. Given this approach it is natural/inevitable that the present political system of the West provides the criterion for evaluating other political ideas and institutions by Popperian analysts.

Thus ideas and institutions are falsified if they fail to conform to Western conceptions of the political good but the possibility of the falsification of Western political conceptions are remote – as post positivist investigations have shown falsification of dominant paradigms can easily be avoided (Rice 1984) Western practices are viewed by political scientists as 'natural, real, reasonable and same' and anti Western practices as 'deviant, unnatural, impractical, irrational, insane'. These pre judgments underlie political science – these pre judgments constitute political science's 'hermeneutic circle' These pre judgments must remain fixed if they are to provide criteria for assessing other practices. Critical reflection is possible only within the hermeneutic circle of political science. The pre suppositions underlying the conception of meaning, relevance, experience and explanation in political science reflect Western conventions traditions and norms.

These presuppositions are evident in the Western definition of politics – Aristotle for example distinguishes between ruling and politics and regards politics as being possible only as a relation among equals (1955). He also insisted that politics could exist only in a "realm of freedom"<sup>lxxiv</sup>. Politics, in this perception is the activity by which equally free citizens define values and create institutions to enable them to live the sort of life they wish to lead. Political knowledge on the other hand is a means for defining the good and the method for achieving it. This knowledge may reveal a truth which is not actualized by the free political activity of a community of equals – and the political thinkers who realize the truth may not have the power to actualize it Aristotle thus recognizes an unbridgeable distance between political practitioners (equal citizens) and political theorists<sup>lxxv</sup>.

The truth revealed in Aristotelian thought is the human telos – the purpose for the attainment of which freedom is a legitimate end. Post enlightenment political science<sup>lxxvi</sup> ostensibly eschews any concern with teleology and concentrates on description and analysis of state institutions – the institutionalist, positivist and pluralist methodologies are explicitly empiricist. The central concern of the institutionalists has been the examining of constitutional provisions to identify structures of governance and distribution of powers in different polities. Politics is thus identified with constitutionally sanctioned behaviour, within the context of government institutions – the executive, legislature and judiciary. Anti constitutional movements – such as those of revolutionaries are thus delegitimized.

Realist political scientists such as Laswell (1950) stress that politics is a study of the distribution of power. Political actors are self interested “power maximizers” and the market model is therefore relevant to an analysis of political behaviour. In this perception the ‘will to power’ determines political action and values used for political mobilization are masks concealing this ‘reality’. Pluralists and institutionalists contend that manipulation of democratic ideals to realize selfish ends is constrained by severe limits in constitutional regimes. Politics in the pluralist perspective is an activity through which diverse interests and values are balanced and reconciled – some political actors may pursue power, but others seek the promotion of distributional equality – and the constitutional regime provides a framework for balancing the orderly pursuit of these diverse and conflicting ends through bargaining, negotiation, and compromise (Lindbolm1965). The good of politics is merely the achievement of this balancing of divergent (equally trivial) conceptions of the good which individuals are free to pursue. The freedom maximizing principle in the pluralist perception is the coalition building and sustaining principle. Pluralism like institutionalism is status quo maintenance oriented and anti constitutional activity is necessarily delegitimized for such activity is based on the premises that some interests are irreconcilable within the context of a constitutional regime. Pluralism endorses what has been described as the emotivist conception of value (Hudson 1970). Political values reflect the sentiments and feelings of political participants and not conceptions of truth. There can be no rational debate about political values since they are a consequence of subjective preference and political science (like economics) has nothing to say about preference formation. Nevertheless pluralism endorses freedom as the ultimate ideal for it like mainstream economics) conceives of the self as choosing its identity and ends arbitrarily<sup>lxxvii</sup>. Indeed freedom appears as the in liberal society permitting the reconciliation of diverse private ends. In reality freedom/capital accumulation alone is recognized as possessing value and all private ends are trivialized (MacIntyre 1981).

The functionalist political scientists (Easton 1971) explicitly recognize the subservience of liberal politics to capital accumulation. Both structural functionalists and systems analysts conceive of liberal politics as a self regulating systemic component of capitalist economy and society fulfilling systems maintenance ‘necessary tasks’. Political science identifies these necessary tasks and conceptualizes efficient methods for their performance.

Functional structuralists recognize that legitimating capitalist order requires cultural contextualization – Japanese capitalism is different from American capitalism as far as its socio-political organization is

concerned. The task of systemic cultural political studies is to generate a scientific understanding of the demands made upon a political system (in terms of state building, redistribution of resources, sustaining national identity consciousness etc.) of specific cultures for the reproduction of capitalist order. The issue of the transition from capitalism remains inconceivable in this context. Functionalist-structuralists and systems analysts (like other major political science schools) participate in the project of universalizing capitalist order by justifying freedom/capital accumulation as the sole legitimate value – the telos of political order.

Modernization / democratization theory is an inheritor of the functionalist approach. The universalisation of liberal democratic practices is seen as both desirable and the inevitable for the universalization of capitalism<sup>lxxviii</sup>. Modernization / democratization theorists argue that there is a two way causative relationship between participation in capitalist markets on the one hand and the fostering of liberal values and commitment to representative democracy on the other. Political organization and movements – specially fundamentalism – which challenge capitalist norms and the democratic organization of society are viewed as irrational. Modernization / democratization theory is a central theoretical initiative for furthering human rights imperialism. Modernist/democratic theorists advocate the suppression of anti-capitalist, anti-democratic tendencies on functionalist grounds – such activity is ‘dysfunctional’ and ‘de-stabilizing’ and most importantly liberalism has no argument for its delegitimation. As Dreben – Rawls’ leading apologist – states.

“We are arguing for a constitutional, liberal democracy. If one cannot see the benefits of living in a liberal constitutional democracy then I do not know how to convince him. What do you say to (him)? The answer is nothing. You shoot him you do not try to reason with him. Reason has no bearing on this question” (2003 p328-329)<sup>lxxix</sup>.

Rawls also describes ideologies which reject constitutional democracy as akin to contagious diseases and advocates that they should be suppressed (1985 p64). Political science thus advocates the universalization of capitalist norms as the substance of an inevitable social development. World Bank and Asian Development Bank programs for promoting ‘good governance’ transfer this ‘knowledge’ to the Muslim world. Modernist political science abandons claims of value neutrality and claims regarding the operationalization of analysis in a non prescriptive manner. It abandons the institutionalist claim that research methodologies are neutral techniques for the organization and collection of data. Modernization / democratization theory argues that the value of freedom, / capital accumulation, is reason’s telos and attempts at transcending freedom through the universalisation of abdiyat are necessarily irrational. Political science creates a world in its own image and uses concepts of passivity, neutrality and objectivity to disguise the fact that this is not the only possible world. These who seek to destroy this world must therefore be suppressed<sup>lxxx</sup>. They cannot be argued with.

Post modernism is a critique of Enlightenment but not a repudiation or rejection of freedom. Indeed it criticizes the Enlightenment project for its failure to achieve / understand freedom (specially as a process). Postmodernism rejects the Enlightenment metanarratives for the realization of freedom (Lyotard 1979)<sup>lxxxi</sup>. It questions the universalisability of Enlightenment values and methods. It argues that

Enlightenment categories (public/private, subject/object, appearance/reality) are not universal or necessary. They can however serve particular historical projects of legitimation of specific configurations of power. That this is not a repudiation of the Enlightenment project is reflected in Foucault's recognition of the need for "continued faith in Enlightenment and the pursuit of patient labour giving form to our impatience for liberty" (1984 p50). The post modernist remains attached to the 'truths' of the Enlightenment<sup>lxxxii</sup> and does not recognize any alternative to freedom. Rather the key concern is with its boundaries and pushing back the limits which restrict the operationalization of freedom.

Post modernist discourses focus on the restrictions on freedom imposed by Enlightenment sanctioned technologies of power and knowledge. Post modernism displays a basic incredulity regarding the Enlightenment's emancipatory claims. Post modernism signals a legitimacy crisis in the epistemological, cultural and political life of modern Western societies. These societies cannot rationally defend their conception of the true, the just or the good. Post modernists such as Rorty argue that there is no need for a rational defense of these conceptions. Knowledge and politics should be concerned with identifying "what works". This "pragmatic turn" makes post-modernism an appropriate apology for globalized capitalism. There are pragmatic grounds for belief in science, reason, democracy and progress – but even in Nietzsche (1973) there is a realization that these beliefs do not lead to freedom. Coles (1997) shows that the view that man is continuously progressing towards the achievement of freedom<sup>lxxxiii</sup> is a means by which we conceal our response to the other – the quest for freedom leads to tyranny and domination as do attempts to transcend the perspectivist limits to understanding. Attempts to grasp the totality of experience – universalizing perspectives – suppress heterogeneity. The pursuit of knowledge / power is "the violent or surreptitious appropriation of a system of rules, which in itself has no essential meaning in order to impose a direction, to bend it to a new will "(Foucault 1984b). All knowledges, economic, cultural, sexual provide conduits for the exercise of power. Power is productive of specific truths for "truth is a thing of this world. It is produced only by virtue of multiple forms of constraints. And it induces regular effects of power. Each society has its regime of truth, its general politics of truth" (Foucault 1980 p131). Transcendence of power (i.e. of capitalism) is not possible. Foucault insists that there is no outside of power. This idea is also reflected in Heidegger's conception of Dasein which questions being and the a priori claims about being made by Enlightenment philosophy, from a distinctly this worldly perspective. Dasein is pre-eminently being in the world limited by specific time and space. Derrida's work shows that it is also limited by its necessary disavowal of the other<sup>lxxxiv</sup>. Derrida analysis the violence immanent to this disavowal of otherness. Deconstruction asserts the essential relatedness of the subject and suggests a consequential instability built into selfhood. The self can never be fully separated from the other despite its experience of differentiation and deferral<sup>lxxxv</sup>. Attempts at differentiation and deferral which always remain incomplete obscure meaning (Holland 1997) and frustrate the Enlightenment project of narrative closure through systematic accumulation of knowledge. Meaning always remains indeterminate and freedom remains an ultimately unachievable objective. According to Derrida (1976) politics provides space for the exercise of dominance and violence in the quest for meaning. Politics makes possible the assertion of an ever elusive mastery.

That this recognition of the impossibility of an achievement of freedom is not a rejection of freedom / capital accumulation as an ideal can be seen for example in the work of feminist post modernists who argue that sexual difference and oppression is produced within the context of certain relations of power and symbolic configurations. This recognition is seen as a liberating experience for it enables women to

understand how they are psychically and socially acculturated as sexed figures and how they might resist the heteronormative narratives that follow from assumptions about immutability of sexed identities within political order (Irigaray 1985 Butler 1997)<sup>lxxxvi</sup>.

Post modernist politics are typically articulated in single issue movements – women, queer, ecology, disarmament, anti racist. They are not a rejection of freedom / capital but an exploration of the limits to which disciplines and their associated dominations can be stretched. Post modernism does not seek to transcend freedom / capital. Its acknowledgement of difference is not an abandonment of the Western claims of superiority. Rather as Rorty argues there is no need to defend the postmodernist preference for liberties on rational grounds. America's only duty is "to please itself" (1998 p18) and the preference for post Christian Western life styles is based on esthetic grounds<sup>lxxxvii</sup>.

Freedom may be seen as a way of regulating and administering a society that depends on the capacities of free (i.e. utility / profit maximizing) individuals. Creating a free society – in post Communist Europe, or post Islamic Afghanistan – involves first of all teaching people methods of calculating and managing that make profit and utility maximization possible. Values of consumerism, competition and accumulation have to be fostered and values of tawakkul, zuhd and sabr have to be delegitimised through the reform of the educational system. Psychotherapists have to supplant the ulema and the soofia to enable people to endure the misery of freedom and the tyranny of capital.

Men are not born free. They are made free by turning them into agents of capital. The rationalities of freedom are pre-eminently economic rationalities. The market is the prime locale for the practise of freedom. The practise of freedom involves the marketisation of not just society but of the individual<sup>lxxxviii</sup>. Economic man values choice for its own sake – he chooses only freedom/capital. To him life is meaningful only to the extent that it yields freedom/capital and freedom/capital acquirement is therefore the only criteria for valuing all acts and relationships. This economic based individuality must become a norm for evaluating political programs and social arrangements in capitalist society. Promoting freedom obsessed individuality is therefore the telos of capitalist governance. It is also an instrument of capitalist governmentality inspiring the creation of a variety of governance technologies. These technologies enable the socialization of freedom in a manner consistent with its individuation. Liberalism may be seen as perhaps the most successful (to date) technology of governance which links the socialization and the individuation of freedom. Liberalism responsabilizes its subjects – they are taught to discipline themselves for the sake of freedom/capital accumulation. They are made to be "willing to do their bit in maintaining the system that defines and delimit them. They must play their parts in a game whose intelligibility and limits they take for granted" (Rajshman 1991). Freeing people – turning them into subjects of capital – necessarily involves their responsabilization, their voluntary acceptance of the discipline of a particular accumulation regime. Liberalism equips the free individual with specific techniques of self understanding and self mastery which internalize capitalist rationality and transfer human being into human capital. Freeing the individual thus involves (a) the universalization of wage labour<sup>lxxxix</sup> and (b) the establishment of the dominance of the financial markets as valuers of all social practices<sup>xc</sup>. Accepting the discipline of the workplace and the money and capital markets is thus a crucial element in the freeing of individuals – in the construction of capitalist subjectivity.



Nurturing capitalist individuality involves the normalization of the individual. The rationality and practices of freedom in the West were technologized through the reinstitutionalization of culture. New spaces had to be created where the free individual could be subjected to normative gazes. Regulation of urban life through police, medical services infrastructural support systems involved the calculated use of architecture in the promotion of regulated liberty. Museums, hospitals, prisons, department stores and exhibitions were designed to discipline and regulate the conduct of the urban masses – and to circumvent and subvert the discipline of religious institutions. The free individual is enmeshed in a web of visibilities of public codes. The family is torn from its communal moorings – the joint family is destroyed and initially the nuclear family, bearer of capitalist values takes its place. The nuclear family is the focus of the deployment of technologies of private responsabilization in early capitalism. (Rose 1987). The nuclear family is subjected to the gaze and discipline of experts – doctors, social workers, marriage counselors, psychiatrists. These experts sanction modes of behaviour which are bearers of capitalist rationality. Experts determine modes for the care of the body, the child, the spouse, the old as means not for serving God but for facilitating capital accumulation<sup>xci</sup>. It is these ulema replacing experts who define the norms of personal behaviour in capitalist society and produce free individuality. Free individuals are governable – they freely accept subjection to capital. To be free is to be attached to capitalist order where certain modes of conducting one's existence are considered as normal by experts espousing capitalist rationality. The norms sanctioned by the experts are the basis on which the free individual judges himself. Secular educational institutions, the school and the university, play a key role in producing responsabilized capitalist subjectivity in the form of the free individual. The essential purpose of liberal education is to create the civilized sensibilities which subvert and ridicule religious consciousness. The greater the self subjection of the individual to capitalist rationality (through the development of appropriate sensibilities) the less the need to subject him to formal structures of governance. Liberalism is distinguishable from anarchism due to its recognition that self subjection to capitalist rationality can never be complete and the need to police, regulate, discipline and govern can never be eliminated<sup>xcii</sup>. The increasing mass of marginalized people unwilling or unable to practice capitalist rationality would always need to be subjected to the formal authority of capitalist institutions – parliaments, prisons, social security agencies, mental asylums, hospitals, schools, universities etc. Normal citizens are also in need of being assigned duties, assigned rights, and assured of the authority of experts. This can be achieved more effectively by agitprop agencies of capital – public and private media and educational institutions – but formal governance processes cannot be dispensed with as far as the performance of this function is concerned.

Freedom exists in capitalist order – and in it alone. Capitalist order requires a de legitimization and disintegration of community. Even the community of labour which had been a product of the dominance of capitalism is destroyed and this destruction is justified by the New Right. Freedom here is individuation – the establishment of an identity through a shaping of everyday life. This identity is created by the use of two distinct technologies of governance – technologies of consumption and psychological technologies. The self of the free individual is constructed by the marketers of products the free individual is induced to desire. Products are imbued with a subjective meaning and associated with a desirable life style. The free individual identifies his self with commodities not ideologies, beliefs or political systems. Identities are purchased in the market. Since all of society becomes a market one is forced to choose and the only possible expression of choice / freedom is the purchase of one commodity rather than another. Self realization in capitalist order is the comodification of life – of work, play, sex,

childbearing, health, education etc. Psychology elaborates the know how of this perveted self realization. Psychologists possess the specialized knowledge of the commodified self (and of its commodification). Freedom is the unending search for the animal sources, secrets and truths of this perverse self. One frees oneself through the application of a rational technology of the self. The free individual frees himself through subordination to a psychotherapist. To live as a free individual he must learn new technologies for practicing upon himself the rationalities of freedom.

Freedom is liberation from religion and subjection to a new priesthood which advocates and legitimates the practise of lust and greed. The aspiration for freedom converts the subject of God into the subject of capital. This conversion is expressed in an unreserved commitment to human rights. Human rights entail duties of capitalist states to ensure the development of capitalist individuality, civil society and some form of republicanism (preferably though not necessarily a representative democracy). Islam rejects the humanist claim that man has rights by virtue of his belonging to a particular biological specie, homo sapien. Human rights are no such rights – they are merely means for constructing capitalist individuality, civil society and some form of republicanism so that the duty of capital accumulation (promotion of avarice and jealousy) may be legitimated and continuously performed.

There are no rights one acquires merely by the biological fact of being a homo sapien. There are no grounds for situating human rights in human “nature”. Human rights are a doctrine legitimizing the rule of capital – i.e. the dominance of individuality, society and state by the vices of avarice and jealousy. That is why human rights are specific to the era of capitalism and are universal only to the extent of the universality of the rule of capital.

It is important to stress that human rights are held by individuals against the state. They are held that is by the individual in his personal / private capacity against his public capacity as a citizen. It is thus quite wrong theoretically to argue – as for example the arrogant. American human rights apologist Jack Donnelly (1988) does – that human rights entail no duties. The “enjoyment” of human rights by the private individual requires that in his public life he implements the rule and the law of capital and continuously constructs capitalist societies and capitalist states. The autonomous individual is not free to reject freedom, to reject the organization of the market and the state in accordance with the law which actualizes the prioritization of capital accumulation – the universal dominance of avarice and jealousy.

Subordinating human nature to the vices of avarice and jealousy is thus a capitalist project. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights lists the duties of states for creating capitalist individuality obsessed with avarice and jealousy. The often stressed commitment by the UN and liberal and social democratic authors to the inalienability of human rights is important in that it shows capitalism’s unwillingness to recognize as human an individuality, which rejects autonomy. An individual whose life is not dominated by avarice and jealousy and who does not prioritize the practise of freedom is not recognized as a human being. Similarly a state which does not perform the duty of constructing capitalist individualities and civil society loses legitimacy. The state must ensure that its’ citizens remain human – i.e. committed to the systemic prioritization of capital accumulation. Other social groups – specially the family – also have the duty to promote capitalist, greed and jealousy obsessed individuality. In capitalist

order families have no right to prevent the practise of Zina by their children for as Western practise has shown the univeresalisation of Zina is an important means for the construction of capitalist individuality, and civil society.

What duties must the state perform to ensure the continuing construction of capitalist individuality and civil society? The Universal Declaration of Human Rights derives its list of human rights from the Dworkinan conception of human beings as autonomous individuals equally entitled to “concern and respect”. These include the Lockean / Jeffersonian rights of life, liberty, property and the pursuit of happiness. Recognition that the propertyless individual must be inclusively integrated into capitalist order has led to the social democratic insistence on widening the list of universal human rights so that the propertyless, also become the subjects of capital. Political and eco-social rights are inter – related in that the state must perform duties in both areas for constructing and nurturing capitalist individuality. Both sorts of rights emerged as a consequence of the conquest of state power by elites committed to autonomy. Liberal elites overthrew authoritarian rule by constructing civil societies and republican states. Social democratic elites incorporated the mass of ordinary people into capitalist order by encumbering the states with Keynesian duties (“welfare rights”).

Constructing capitalist order requires commitment to two central values – autonomy and equality. This essentially requires that the state does not constrain liberty on the grounds that one citizen’s conception of the good is superior to another’s. Treating each person with “equal concern and respect” implies taking all ends as of equal value – i.e. of no value at all. The only valuable end is freedom – the right to choose any equally valueless end – and to increase resources (Rawls’ primary goods) for the exercise of this absurd choice. Accumulation is thus an end in itself and the subject of accumulation losses all moral worth for all his choices are equally valueless. In this fantasy of evil the equality and autonomy “enjoyed” by the citizen is purely formal. In theory he can choose any way of life in practise he is compelled to choose a way of life that prioritises accumulation (avarice and jealousy) for it is this (substantive) choice alone which makes possible the (formal) choice of any way of life. It is in this sense that Foucault often spoke of the “compulsions of freedom”.

A capitalist life is a necessarily rational choice for all (normal) individuals in capitalist order. A religious life is necessarily a life of surrender (Kant would call it heteronomy). If this surrender is not restricted to the “private” life of the individual (i.e. to the level of a trivial merely esthetic, valueless choice) it makes the construction of civil society and a constitutional republic impossible. The capitalist state is therefore necessarily anti-religious in that its law obligates its subject to confine his moral valuations to his personal life. As citizen, his valuation is necessarily immoral – in that it assigns worth to acts in accordance only to their contribution to increasing the resources for freedom (capital accumulation).

The capitalist state refrains from “enforcing a particular version of the good life” only as far as valueless personal choices are concerned – i.e. choices to which value cannot be assigned by capitalist valuation processes. At the public level it ruthlessly enforces the capitalist way of life with all the force that it can

command. Enforcing human rights is a means for ensuring (a) that (private) moral valuations of individuals are rendered equally trivial and barred from affecting (immoral) public choices and (b) public choices are valued systemically in terms of their contribution to capital accumulation (i.e. evil) alone. The autonomy / dignity of the individual is defined in terms of his commitment to the equal triviality of all moral evaluations on the one hand and to capitalist rationality on the other.

In this order the divine right of the king is substituted by the divine right of the individual but the individual is king only if he is committed to capitalist rationality at the public level and committed to the trivialization of all moral evaluations. Equally autonomous individuals publicly sanction all ends made possible by capital accumulation. In public life capital accumulation is the only “end in itself”. Capitalist rationality rejects the possibility of a moral evaluation of capital accumulation – the operation of capitalist markets (commodity, money, shares) articulate this impossibility. The universalization of human rights is a necessary consequence of the globalization of capitalist markets.

The popular demand for the recognition of universal human rights is thus based on a prior acceptance of the legitimacy of capitalist property (i.e. property dedicated to accumulation for its own sake). In societies, such as Afghanistan and Pakistan, where capitalist property is not socially legitimated there is no popular demand for universal human rights. As against this there is a popular demand for human rights practice in urban and SEZised parts of China where people yearn for full participation in capitalist property relationships.

The concept of capitalist property is based on the premises that man is an owner of himself. But in a fundamental sense the Lockean “Law of Nature” (Reason) requires that this possession be forfeited to capital. In Locke’s system “the right to self preservation” is best articulated in the individual’s right to unlimited private property. Locke argues that the purpose of civil society is to preserve property (1967, 3.1-3, 85, 15-16, 173, 6-8). One’s Body is one’s property (Locke 1967, 179.2-3). This conception of the Body as individual property lies at the base of Locke’s (and subsequently Ricardo’s and Marx’s) labour theory of value. The Body thus is the basis of capitalist property since the purpose of being (individual and social) is to preserve Freedom. Locke recognizes a duty to labour productively (1967, 32.1). Hence the Body is capitalist property because it provides a basis for (and ought to be used for) unlimited accumulation (Freedom) Locke argues that capitalist money which can be accumulated without limit removes the natural law constraints on individual accumulation (1967, p 46 28-30). Locke justifies the massacre of the Red Indians and the seizure of their lands as a means for making unlimited accumulation possible (1967 36-18, 41, 1-3, passim).

Accumulation is justified however only if the property appropriated (by the slaughter of the Red Indians in America) is put to “use” – i.e. used for further accumulation. Rawls and Dworkin are firmly in the

Lockean tradition when they suggest that use must involve egalitarian concerns since without this unlimited accumulation cannot be “used” to construct a fully inclusive capitalist order.

The all encompassing (inclusive) nature of capitalist property is graphically illustrated by Locke’s definition of property Locke writes.

“He seeks out and is willing to enjoy in society with others.... for the natural. Preservations of the Lives, Liberties and Estates which I call by the general name Property” (1967: 123, 14-17, Emphases in original).

The individuals’s Body, liberty and estates all are Property in the sense that all are instruments for useful production and society’s over riding purpose is the ‘enjoyment of Property’ – i.e. accumulation. Both “negative” and “positive” rights are recognized by liberal governments for the purpose of “the enjoyment of Property” Locke writes “Law is.... the direction of a free and intelligent Agent to his proper Interest ... the end of Law is to preserve and enlarge Freedom” (1967, 57, 10-13, 17-18). As we have seen Freedom is merely the “enjoyment of Property”. The “enjoyment of Property” is thus the end served by the rule of law. The rule of law is thus an instrument for the Rule of Capital.

The Second Treatise only recognizes one positive right, the right to property. This is because property is a precondition for autonomy. In the market property owners are enabled to autonomously construct contracts. From a liberal perspective there are no propertyless individuals in a capitalist market – for every individual possesses his Body the original repository of Property. Formally equal contracts can be constructed as long as the ‘right to work’ – the willingness of an owner of estates to enter into a contact with an owner of a Body on terms of formal equality – exists. It is only the unemployed (rigorously speaking the unemployable) who are propertyless and excluded from the circuit of capital. Welfare rights are recognized by social democrat regimes and theorists such as Rawls and Dworkin as necessary for extending capitalist property to the growing multitude of stateless individuals in civil society and to eliminate unemployment. It is in the social democratic states that the domination of capital is most comprehensive though this comprehensiveness often has to be “purchased” at the cost of deceleration in the rate of capital accumulation.

The doctrine of the divinity and omnipotence of man is the essence of human rights ideology. It has always been a revolutionary ideology. That is why Locke’s Second Treatise concludes with a defense of the right to revolt. Liberalism is essentially a revolt against Allah’s sovereignty for it sees universal human nature as committed to self creation and to the creation of the world through labour leading to the accumulation of property. Liberalism revolts against regimes which do not prioritize the accumulation of property by performing the duties required for the universal practise of human rights. Liberalism demands that all conceptions of human nature which reject the autonomy of the individual be abandoned. The central purpose of human rights ideology is to delegitimize all political regimes based

on the concept of Allah's sovereignty and to replace them by regimes committed to the sovereignty of capital. Property as conceived by Locke and Kant and Paine resides essentially in the Body which actualizes its Freedom by accumulation of Money. The Body is thus an instrument of capital (avarice and jealousy) and asserting the sovereignty of the equal and autonomous avaricious and jealous individual, his right to make his self and the world his creation is asserting the sovereignty of capital. It is nothing else.

Capital is evil (Badiou 2001). Typically men do not naturally submit to it en masse. An influential group of evil men possessed by the devils of avarice and jealousy seize control of the apparatus of governance – specially legitimization discourses – and establish the sovereignty of capital on unwilling populations. This can be seen most clearly by seeking to understand the organic and unbreakable link between liberalism and imperialism.

The presently dominant universal human rights regime was born in America in the late 18<sup>th</sup> century. America had been the theatre of the mass slaughter of Red Indians – fifteen million of whom perished during three centuries (Dee 1970). In a fundamental sense it was this slaughter and the theft and plunder of an entire continent which made the construction of a constitutional regime possible. George Washington was aware of this and repeatedly felt compelled to justify the mass slaughter of the Red Indians on the grounds that "Red Indian tribes are wolves in human clothing and the survival of human civilization depends on their extermination" (Dec. 1970 p.41).

The American Declaration of Independence (1776) is the world's first political document legitimizing national sovereignty on the basis of human rights ideology. The American constitution incorporates this commitment to human rights. The anti federalists who apposed the constitution did so specifically on the grounds that its' enactment would lead to the rule of capitalists and financiers over America (Elster 1993 p463). The most important objective of the constitution was to protect the (capitalist) minority from the tyranny of the majority. The Federalists did not claim that the constitution reflected the will of the people nor was the constitution ever endorsed by a popular referendum. The authors of the Federalist Papers saw themselves as "political scientists" with access to a superior knowledge, which identifies the "true good" of the people and the means for attaining it. The American constitution is based on this "true knowledge". It is not based on the will of the people (Rousseau's "will of all").

The American constitution is seen by the authors of the Federalist Papers as based on an authentic reading of the Book of Nature which enunciates eternally valid and immutable principles of governance for the establishment of justice. John Rawls and Ronald Dworkin are reiterating these claims when they argue for the universalization of human rights.

The fictitious Book of Nature (which has replaced the Books of Allah as the source of hidayat) ordains that the achievement of freedom / abundance requires the rule of the capitalists for it is they alone who can organize the market and the state for the achievement of abundance. Therefore the particular interest of the capitalists (and their representatives) is the interest not only of America but of all of mankind. It is the universal interest and America has the duty to ensure it's universal dominance through the universalisation of human rights i.e. of global capitalist order.

Human rights are thus in a very important sense prior to democracy. Duties associated with them must be imposed upon a state before it can be allowed to practise democracy. This is because human rights construct autonomous (avarice and jealousy obsessed) individuality on the one hand and protect the capitalist minority from the "tyranny of the majority" on the other. That is why the UN Charter of Human Rights is modeled on the American Bill of Rights and the Declaration of Independence. The Charter, the Bill and the Declaration all proclaim the equal autonomy of the individual. This commits democratic – and all other republican – regimes to an acceptance of the doctrine of self creation which is the fountainhead of capitalist order. A religious state cannot be considered legitimate in the perspective of human rights ideology for such a state necessarily denies man's capability of self and world creation. There is simply no basis in Islam or Christianity for recognizing human rights. That is why Locke could not substantiate his claim that God wills human self-determination by direct reference to the Bible.

The only legitimate regime according to human rights ideology is a constitutional – not necessarily a democratic - republic. Such a republic proclaims man's sovereignty in principle and the sovereignty of capital in practice. This is because a constitutional regime accords value only to freedom i.e. the accumulation of means for the satisfaction of any equally trivial ends. It necessarily rejects morality by "taking the difference between persons seriously" and regarding all private valuations as equally worthless. Treating the individual with "concern and respect" amounts to equalization / trivialization of all moral choices and therefore necessarily, valuing outcomes / choices solely in terms of their contribution towards accumulation of resources for the satisfaction of equally trivial and valueless ends. It is therefore not surprising that constitutional republics are necessarily dominated by capitalist oligarchs whose personal choices (leading a life of avarice and covetousness) coincide with the preferences of the socially valued way of life. In practice it is capitalist norms and values that are imposed upon all citizens – indeed one is a citizen only to the extent one considers legitimate the social prioritization of accumulation. Human rights ideology and its practise makes it impossible that an alternative social prioritization be articulated.

Repression is thus necessarily part of the agenda of universal human rights. Such repression is usually justified in the name of "the people" – this was first done by the authors of the American constitution. The mass slaughter of fifteen million Red Indians, the fire bombing of Dresden and Tokyo, the atomic attacks on Hiroshima, the napalming of Vietnam, the use of daisy cutter bombs in Afghanistan, the

constant state terrorism leading to the death of millions of Iraqi children and the occupation of Iraq and Palestine – all these are the legitimate acts of a liberal regime which justifies them on the basis of human rights ideology, in the name of “we, the people”.

Michael Mann has argued that there is a relationship between liberal democracy and genocide (1999). Liberal democracies continuously commit ideologically legitimated genocide (Vietnam, Palestine, Iraq, Afghanistan) argues Mann. The greater the commitment to homogenize behaviour through the acceptance of human rights as a universal norm and the consequent (equal) trivialization of personal ends, the greater the temptation to murder those who refuse to accept these norms. This “other” has to be coerced or induced to assimilate i.e. to submit to the sovereignty of capital. Submission to capital / human rights is a necessary condition for survival in liberal order. Human rights ideology does not advocate peaceful coexistence. Races such as the Red Indian and states such as Afghanistan and Iraq, which do not submit to the sovereignty of capital, have to be exterminated. The edifice of liberal America was built on the corpses of fifteen million slaughtered Red Indians and the preservation of global order requires the mass slaughter of the Afghans and Iraqis. Mann is conscious of liberalism’s compulsive commitment to exterminate “outsiders” when he discusses the behaviour of settler communities in eighteenth century North America – “the greater the democracy among the perpetrators the greater the genocide “(1999 p.26)”. The (liberal) rule of “we the people” thus necessarily requires the elimination of the other. That is why “ethnic cleansing, murder, deporting, genocide was central to the liberal modernity of the New World “(Mann 1999 p. 27)”.

The ethnic cleansing of the whole of Asia and Africa has never been a viable project – Cecil Rhodes and Lord Macaulay came to this conclusion centuries ago. It becomes increasingly unviable as the share of the European races in world population continues to fall – (UN 2000) – and as the European races age. Repression must therefore take the form of imposing the rule of capital through universalizing human rights and destroying state authority in Asia and Africa.

#### Summary: Political Science and Capitalism

- Purpose – legitimation of capitalist order with particular reference to the state.
- Originates in the work of the French Encyclopedists of the 18<sup>th</sup> century which rejected Christian metaphysics and emphasized empiricism.
- This implies reliance on this world (and not the world to come) as the source of knowledge and value. Political institutions are justified not with reference to divine law but in terms of their contribution to human happiness in this world. Political science is essentially utilitarian.
- Political science methodology claims to be inductionist – generalizations are supposed to be basis on empirical observation of particulars. Such inductionism yields laws which supposedly explain past events and predict the future.



- However scientific knowledge is not generated by inductionism (Hume, Popper). Empiricism can never establish necessary connections between events. Moreover the observer necessarily imposes his theoretical categories on the observed. All theories based on non observable phenomena.
- The Popperian methodology which dominates political analysis holds that theories should be held on to until falsified by observation of facts. It is committed to incrementalism and problem solving. Ultimate values can never be justified. Hence preferences have to be taken as given in political science as in economics and the market is often a model for political science analysis.
- Present post Popperian political analysis is concerned not with truth but with 'what works' within the context of Western capitalist polities which therefore provide the criteria for evaluating all political ideas/institutions.
- If non Western political idea/institution do not conform to Western ones, they are falsified. But Western political ideas/institutions cannot be falsified since they represent the dominant paradigm and the dominant paradigm related practices are 'natural, rational' whereas non Western practices are "irrational, unnatural". Western norms are political science's prejudgments which must remain fixed if they are to provide assessment criteria. Critical assessment is only possible within the dominant paradigm. The presuppositions underlying the dominant paradigm are all based on Enlightenment norms and Western practices.
- These pre suppositions are reflected in Western definitions of politics Aristotle defines politics as "a relation among equals" (no riaya ) and possible only within a "realm of freedom". Equally free citizens define values and establish institutions to enable them to lead the life they value. This is politics. Political knowledge defines the good and identifies the method to achieve it.
- In Aristotle's thought freedom is a means to human flourishing. Mainstream institutionalist, pluralist, positivist political science identifies flourishing with freedom and describes/evaluates institutions on this basis. Approved politics is constitutionally sanctioned behaviour. Anti constitutional activities are delegitimized.
- The realist school sees political actors as power maximisers. They use the market model in analyzing behaviour. Political institutions are masks concealing 'the will to power'.
- Pluralists, institutionalists and realists endorse the constitutional regime as providing a legitimate framework for the pursuit of power and of diverse interests. Freedom/power is maximized when balancing of diverse interests is effectively sustained.
- The presumption is that all interests are reconcilable within a constitutional regime and anti-constitutional activities are therefore de-legitimized. The constitutional regime makes possible the arbitrary choice of identity and ends by every self and freedom is the modus vivendi which makes possible the pursuit of diverse private ends. These ends are trivial and freedom alone has political value.
- Functionalists recognize the subservience of liberal politics to capital. System theorists and structuralists conceive of the political system as a self regulatory component of capitalist economy/society. System maintenance is it's necessary task.
- Functionalists recognize that legitimizing capitalist order requires cultural contextualisations – different capitalist governance systems (US, Japan) and cultures may impose different requirements

on state institutions, resource distribution, identity consciousness etc. and these must be reconciled with the need for capital accumulation. System cultural political studies address this issue. They show that capital accumulation is possible in different cultural contexts and transition from capitalism is impossible / undesirable.

- Modernisation / democratization theory is a follow up of functionalism. It seeks the universalization of liberal practices and capitalism. It sees a relationship between participation in markets, acceptance of liberal values and participation in liberal institutions. Opposing representative democracy / capitalism is viewed as irrational. It advocates suppression of all anti liberal activities. It cannot justify liberal democracy. Good governance programs should be seen in this context. These programs promote the knowledge that there is no alternative to capitalist development / liberal institutions.
- Modernisation theory is aggressively non neutral about values. It sees freedom as reason's telos and attempts at transcending freedom as irrational.
- Political science creates a world in its own image and like economics, uses concepts of neutrality and objectivity to disguise the fact that this is not the only possible world.
- Post modernism is a critique of Enlightenment but not a rejection of freedom. It criticizes Enlightenment for its failure to achieve / understand freedom. It rejects Enlightenment metanarratives, methods and categories and regards them as non universal and non necessary.
- These methods / projects, can serve particular projects of legitimating specific configurations of power. The concern is to expand the realm of liberty within the order of capital. The post modernist does not recognize any alternative to freedom and capitalism. Post modernists seek to reduce restrictions imposed on freedom by Enlightenment technologies of power and knowledge.
- Post modernism recognizes that Enlightenment conceptions of the true and the good cannot be rationally defended but Rorty argues that there is no need for such defense. They are justified on esthetic and pragmatic grounds. And we should be concerned with what works. This makes post modernism an appropriate apology for globalised capitalism.
- Post modernists argue that plurality is to be encouraged for it is a means for expanding the boundaries of freedom and does not constitute a threat to capital. Transcendence of capitalism is not possible. 'There is no outside of power' (Foucault) Heidegger and Derrida also emphasize the impossibility of transcending capitalism.
- Derrida stresses the impossibility of separating the self from the other despite difference. This makes freedom an ultimately unachievable objective. Politics according to Derrida provides space for asserting dominance in the name of freedom.
- Movements inspired by post modernist politics such as anti globalization, feminism etc. are seeking an expansion of the limits of freedom. Thus feminist politics seeks liberation from heteronormality (Irigaray). The feminist preference for the post Christian life does not need to be defended on rational grounds according to the post modernists.
- Freedom is a method for regulating a capitalist society. People have to be taught the utility calculus. Values of consumerism and competition have to be fostered and the value of Tawakkal / Zuhd

delegitimised. Psychoanalysts have to show people how to bear the misery of freedom and the tyranny of capital.

- Men are made free by their subjection to capital. Both the individual and society has to be marketised. Man must be taught to value choice for its own sake and to accept freedom/capital as the only criteria for valuing all acts / relationships. This provides the basis for valuing politics.
- The telos of governance is the promotion of capitalist individuality. Liberalism is the most successful governmentality technology for linking the socialization and the individuation of freedom. Liberalism teaches the individual how to discipline himself for capital accumulation. The individual willingly submits to the discipline of capital. He accepts capitalist order as rational / inevitable. Techniques of self understanding/self mastery are promoted which internalize capitalist rationality and convert human being into human capital.
- This requires:
  - × universalisation of avarice /jealousy
  - × establishment of financial markets as valuers of all practices.
  - × acceptance of the discipline of the work place.
- Creating capitalist individuality requires the creation of a hedonist / anti religious culture. Establishment of the authority of the police, the psychiatrist, the doctor, the department store, the museum.
- The family is torn from its communal base and becomes a bearer of capitalist values. The family is subjected to the gaze / discipline of experts who sanction models of behaviour specifying modes for the care of the body and the child for enhancing capital accumulation. Capitalist individuality is produced by the doctor, the marketer, the psychiatrist, the social worker, the policeman who define normal behaviour. Such normalization makes individuals governable.
- The free individual judges / disciplines himself on the basis of the norms specified by experts specially in schools/universities. The essential purpose of secular education is to create the sensibilities which subvert /ridicule/deform religious consciousness
- Liberalism recognizes that self subjection to capitalist rationality can never be complete. Normalized citizens must be subjected by the assignment of duties / rights. But mass media makes capitalist governmentality easy.
- Freedom exists in capitalist order through individualization but this destroys communities (including that of labour). The free self is constructed through psychological technologies and technologies of consumption. The free individual identifies himself with products not ideologies. Identities are purchased in the market Freedom is merely choosing one commodity rather than another. Capitalist self realization is commodification of all of life. Psychologists possess the specialized knowledge of the commodified self. They reveal the truths of the animal self. This legitimizes the practise of lust and greed. This is the basis for the universalization of human rights.
- Human rights entail the duties of capitalist states to ensure the development of capitalist individuality and civil society for capital accumulation.

- Human rights legitimate the universalization of avarice / covetousness. That is why they are specific to capitalism.
- Human rights are the public duty of the free individual to uphold the law of capital in the form of the free market and the capitalist state.
- The UN Declaration refuses to recognize as human, individuals and states which reject freedom / capital accumulation. Both state and society must promote the universalization of avarice / jealousy – specially Zina for without this construction of capitalist individuality and civil society is impossible.
- Constitutional and welfare rights subject the individual to capitalist property. This entails that acts are valued only to the extent to which they contribute to accumulation. All other choices / acts are valueless / trivial. Capitalist order is therefore necessarily anti religious.
- Enforcing human rights requires (a) acceptance of personal moral choices as equally trivial (b) subjecting all public acts to the criteria of accumulation (avarice / jealousy).
- Popular demand for human rights exists only where capitalist property is considered legitimate.
- Capitalist property is based on the acceptance of the Body as belonging to man. But according to Locke the owner of this property must dedicate it to accumulation. The Body is thus capitalist property because the purpose of Being in to promote Freedom. There is thus a duty to labour productively to accumulate.
- Locke justifies the massacre of the Red Indians because this facilitated accumulation and Freedom is only the Enjoyment of Property. The rule of law (rights) is thus a means for the rule of capital.
- There is only one human right – the right to property. The right to life can be respected only if the Body is recognized as property. Revolt is justified against states which do not recognize man's ownership / sovereignty over his Body and therefore over the world. Liberalism is a revolt against Allah's sovereignty. Capital alone is sovereign and the Body is its instrument.
- Men do not naturally submit to capital. They have to be forced to be free. That is why liberalism is linked to imperialism. The mass murder of the Red Indians made possible the establishment of America – the first constitutional regime. The American constitution justifies the creation of the state on the basis of human rights and the anti federalists argued that this was in the interest of capitalists. The authors of the constitution saw themselves as political scientists who possessed knowledge of the true good of the people, this requires the rule of the capitalists who alone can ensure freedom / abundance. America thus has the duty to uphold the law of capital globally to ensure the universalization of freedom.
- America is committed to the universalization of human rights and the destruction of states which reject human sovereignty. Democracy is a means for universalisability human rights, capitalist order. It is not an end in itself.
- In constitutional regimes freedom is prioritized which necessarily means promotion of avarice / jealousy. The bearer of these values dominate society and all other values are trivialized. Those who reject these dominant values must be repressed. Liberal regimes massacred and celebrate the massacre of Red Indians, Vietnamese, Afghanistanees, Iraqis. Liberal regimes commit ideologically

legitimated genocide. They have universalized human rights and homogenized behaviour through genocide and plunder.

- Ethnic cleansing of Asia/Africa is not practical so these states must be dominated through subjecting them to the sovereignty of global financial markets and universal standardization of rules of state behaviour which makes possible the limitless expansion of capital. International organizations work for America and for the American dominance of the global capitalist system. Non-territorial imperialism functions through the Americanization of the socio-political system of dominated countries. Within these countries American ideologies and governance processes alone are recognized as legitimate and reasonable. State elites in dominated countries legitimize Americanization.
- America recognizes as legitimate only constitutional regimes for they alone can integrate into global capitalist order. All other regimes must be subjected to genocide for human rights imperialism demands total, unconditional and final surrender to capital.

### 3.4. Marxist Social Theory

This section concentrates on showing the relationship between Marxist social theory and capitalist order. I do not look at sociology as a discipline because sociology's role in legitimating and providing a governance technology for capitalist order is obvious and self evident. Legitimizing and providing tools for the management of capitalist social order is the telos of all sociological theoretical schools.

This is most clearly evident in Habermas' first major statement in this field made in the late 1960s. Habermas' main concern in this work was to challenge the hegemony of positivistic sociological approaches and to show that access to the symbolically structured object domain of social hegemony called for an interpretative and phenomenological approach. Habermas however emphatically rejected "hermeneutic idealism". He explicitly recognized the usefulness of positivist studies (while questioning their methodological framework) and sought in integration between 'explanatory' and interpretative approaches (1991 p17-30). He found functionalism useful in understanding the objective interconnection of social actions. In Habermas' view functionalism does furnish important tools for analyzing the objective interconnection of actions. But functionalism ignores or obscures the hermeneutic dimensions of social analysis. Interpretive and phenomenological accounts supplement and complete functionalist analysis by providing space for a recognition of "repressed needs which are not absorbed into social roles, transformed into motivations and sanctioned" (1991 p64). Thus Habermas vision of a historically oriented theory of society, a "systematically generalized history" reflectively grasping the formative processes of society and reconstructing it with reference to a specific anticipated future is similar to that of the orthodox social theorists such as Durkheim and Pareto. Interpretivist and phenomenologists merely deepen this analysis.

Habermas does this by using psychoanalysis as a model for reconceptualizing and reintegrating functionalist and interpretative approaches. Habermas views psychodynamic theory as a general interpretative scheme of psychodynamic development. Its reconstruction of individual life histories makes possible a combination of causal explanations and interpretative understanding (Habermas 2001). Building upon Freud's methods and insights Habermas calls for "a hermeneutically enlightened historically oriented functionalism.... guided by an emancipatory cognitive interest that aims at reflection ... (from) an anticipated point of view" (1992 p134). It is clear that there is room within Habermas' system, for modified versions of symbolic interactionism, functionalism and ethnomethodology. His universal pragmatics and attempts to situate social scientific inquiries in a theory of language may be viewed as something of a retreat in methodological terms (reflected in his inability to justify universalisability and human rights) but he continues to find something of value in all the major sociological schools of thought. This is amply evident for example in Habermas' Post National Constellation.

Habermas can eclectically synthesize all mainstream sociological schools and find something of value in all of them because he views capitalist norms, regulatory procedure and transactionary forms as natural and eternal (that he cannot justify them is another matter). There is no need to transcend capitalism because unconstrained communication will universalize freedom i.e. unconstrained capital accumulation. Marxist social theory is the Enlightenment inspired paradigm which claims to reject capitalist order. We now turn to an investigation of this claim.

Habermas of course began as a Marxist – a student of Adorno and Horkheimer, a member of the Frankfurt school. Is he a traitor? Habermas' frequent trips to Iran are surreptitiously organized by the American CIA (as are Chomsky's world lecture tours). Much of Habermas' research – and that of his acolytes – is funded by the Rand Foundation. His advice is eagerly sought for by the commissioners of the European Union. But is Habermas a traitor to Marxism?

To answer this question we must present Marx's social theory. Marx's critique of capitalism was grounded in his theory of alienation. Capitalist society is so organized that it allows private proprietors to appropriate the fruits of the labour of others through the determination of value in the market. Abolishing the market would abolish the 'private appropriation' of others' labour and thus overcome alienation. Abolishing the market is possible because in Marx's view certain features of the capitalist organization of production are not natural (as the classical and new classical economists argue) but social historical. Capitalist society is ridden with contradiction and is (partially) irrational. It cannot achieve its avowed objective of a 'state of abundance' (maximization of production) so that the principle of 'from each according to his ability to each according to his need' can become operational. Marx endorses this principle and the rationality of the objective of seeking to achieve a state of abundance.

Marx rejects the classical / neo classical formulation of the relations of production as merely technical means for the efficient maximization of output (Marx 1966). The labour time which determines a commodity's (exchange) value is not embodied labour but 'socially necessary labour'. Value is labour for others, alienated labour – labour socially recognized as the essence of a commodity. Value is homogenized labour whose qualities have been reduced to the single quality of duration. Value realized through exchange (i.e. in markets) has (non natural) social foundations (Marx 1971). It is the social organization of production through the market which gives labour its 'value form'. Marx sees capitalist property in the (narrow) sense that the individual participates in production for himself and not for serving explicit social needs. The capitalist system seeks to co-ordinate the activities of 'private producers' which are nevertheless not producing for themselves but for others. These 'private producers' necessarily alienate their own labour and appropriate the alienated labour of others. In a commodity producing (market dominated) society needs can be satisfied only through the production of (exchange) value. The division of labour is regulated through the exchange of commodities as value.

The (exchange) value of a commodity thus expresses the social relations of the people who produce and exchange. The value form of the product of labour is the most universal expression of the capitalist mode of production according to Marx (1971 p571-2). Transcending this value form is a crucially important means for the overthrow of capitalist order.

Marx criticizes classical political economy for abstracting from the social context in which labour appears as value form. He criticizes the conception of isolated capitalist individuality and the conception of production and exchange as essentially technical processes necessary for the realization of the state of abundance. Thus the social relations of capitalist production are naturalized and presented as the free expression of rationality. The individual is free to choose 'his ends and the efficient functioning of market processes ensures that means for achieving these ends are being optimally produced and distributed.

Classical political economy presumes that the individual is free in two senses. He is endowed with capitalist property and is not encumbered by external moral claims and obligations. These are necessary presuppositions for rational judgment of self interest according to the classical economists. Society ought to be organized to promote individual capitalist endowment and man's freedom from external moral obligations (heteronomy). Capitalist society claims to be the very Eden of the imamate rights of man.... the exclusive realm of Freedom Equality, Property and Benthan (Marx 1971 p280).

But argues Marx capitalist society is not a relation between abstract private individuals. In Marx's view capitalist society is a dense network of social relationships between 'private' property owners. However the 'private' act production is necessarily contextualized by a social division of labour expressed in the totality of capitalist relations of production and exchange. 'Private' property, according to Marx, is a specific form of the social relations of capitalist production and exchange. The commodity is not merely a thing. It is also a social relation. In capitalist society 'private' property establishes a relation between an individual and a value. For the commodity is produced as bearer of (exchange) value and not merely as a thing. If the commodity is seen as a social relation between 'propertyed' and 'property less' individuals, capitalist relations of production cannot be viewed as relations between isolated individuals. They must be seen as relations between possessors and non possessors of 'private' property.

Production organized for the purpose of producing surplus value which can be privately appropriated is according to Marx a barrier to the free development of the production forces, a barrier which comes to the surface in crises' (Marx 1966 part II p527-528). Marx defines capital as 'value in process, money in process' (1971 p256). He sees capital as a process in which money / value acquires the power of self expansion (1973 p 258). The capitalist form of the labour process allows the capitalist to 'privately' appropriate the total value produced, to pay the labourer a wage equivalent to the value of labour power purchased and to retain 'surplus value' (1971 p291-292). This retention is possible according to Marx because the capitalist 'owns' the means of production and subsistence which can be accessed by labour only through the sale of his labour power. The capitalist can / must control the labourer because the capitalist 'owns' the means of production and subsistence. The purpose of capitalist production is the production of surplus value and the production of use value is merely a mean to this end. From this Marx concluded that increased production would be accompanied by increased deprivation of the workers (Marx 1966 pt. 1 p377-380).

This (expected) deprivation is a consequence of the continuing separation of the labourer from capitalist property in the process of production. The labourer loses his substantive freedom and equality by being separated from and subjection to capitalist property (Marx 1971 p729-30, 733-41). It is "the monopolization of the means of production by a certain section of society confronting (workers) as labour power (embodied) in products and working condition rendered independent of labour power" (Marx 1974 p793-794) which creates and reproduces the deprivation and alienation of labour.

If the labourer could appropriate the whole of the product, alienation / deprivation would end. Locke recognized this but he also recognized the labourer's right to assign his right to another in return for a fixed wage. Justice requires an equivalence between the value of the wage and the value of the product. Such an equivalence is impossible in what Marx calls "the capitalist mode of production" where the production of surplus value and its private appropriation is the purpose of all economic activity.



By endorsing value and class as the fundamental concepts underlying his theory of capitalist order Marx is announcing his acceptance of Enlightenment, ontological assumptions. More accepts Enlightenment values, freedom and equality, and endorses the quest for abundance. He rejects the claims of classical political economists and sociologists regarding the natural / rational character of capitalist institutions – market, factory, “private” property, money, finance etc. Capitalist institutions and capitalist order as a whole is irrational according to Marx because it prevents the achievement of abundance and freedom. Market allocative efficient does not generate freedom / abundance or equality. On the contrary it generates deprivation / alienation for the masses because of the ‘private’ appropriations of surplus product in the form of surplus value. It is not the production of surplus in ever expanding volume to which Marx objects – Marx is a materialist primarily because he accepts the quest for abundance as the essential force enabling social transformation. Marx objects to the production of surplus in the form of surplus value and to the “private” appropriation of this surplus value Marxism seeks an abolition of the ‘market and of the private appropriation of surplus as a means for the achievement of abundance / freedom.

As history has shown this is a strategy for a reorganization of capitalist order not a means for its overthrow. The common metaphysical roots of liberalism and socialism – Marxist or otherwise – are obvious. They become even more manifest when we examine Marx’s vision of communist society, the state of abundance at the end / beginning of history. This is presented in Appendix 2.

Marx was tremendously influenced by the same rational and romantic thinkers who inspired the founders of liberalism. To begin with it is striking to note that in his description of ideal society Marx pays so little attention to the associations and institutional forms that will replace the structures of capitalism. He concentrates almost exclusively on describing the qualities of the “species man” whose evolution under communism finally coincides with the evolution of each individual. The communist individual, according to Marx.

1. Is interested in and able to carry out a wide range of tasks.
2. Is highly and consistently co-operative.
3. Has a masterful control over nature.
4. Regulates his activities without externally imposed laws, customs and rules.
5. Is indistinguishable from other communist men when viewed from the perspective of social divisions (race, religion occupation, family etc.)

The construction of the personality of this “species being”, is begun by the dictatorship of the proletariat and is completed under full blown communism. Marx believes in the potential divinity, there is no other word for it, of man. He believes that each individual is driven by an inner urge to realize this potential and that the overall fulfillment of the potential of each individual requires the simultaneous fulfillment of all others. Liberalism shares at least the first two of these assumptions and although most liberals would regard the third as unrealistic there is a never ending liberal search for social forms which reconcile the search for individual fulfillment with the quest for maximum social welfare. That is why the overwhelming majority of the non American, non vulgar critiques of Marxism presented by liberals question not the values underlying Marxism but the social processes – revolution, dictatorship of the proletariat, organization of communist society-through which they are to be realized. As far as ultimate values are concerned there is much that is common between socialism and liberalism.

In order to unearth the individualist basis of Marx’s thought one has to focus on the relationship of the work of Kant and Hegel. Kant asserts that the individual has objective value in himself and hence the particular life chosen by him necessarily embodies this value. But the particular will must respect the equal value of the particular life chosen by the other. Since the particular will in the Kantian conception has value, has an immediate embodiment of the single individual’s absolute will, it cannot as a particular will be concerned with anything but its own life – certainly not with realizing the absolute value that lies in the other. There is thus an unsurmountable separation and opposition between the particular and the universal dimensions of individual life.

Kant argues that if freedom is to be realized pure reason in virtue of which the individual is of absolute value must itself be practical. Pure reason must be capable of determining the particular will in accordance with substantive laws that are purely rational. Kant failed to show however how substantive moral laws are derivatives of pure reason. Within the ‘Kantian system pure reason and absolutely free will remain empty concepts incapable of determining practical, empirical life. Hegel attempts to address this weakness of the Kantian system and to show how the self determination of a free rational will is actualized in nature and history. In Hegel’s thought pure reason and the free will is an infinite spirit that realizes its absolute value in coming to see in the world of particulars a structure which is perfectly rational because it is purely the product of Spirit’s drive to realize its own absolutely and inherently free nature. Spirit known itself as the creator (Khaliq) and sustainer (Rab) of the world. Spirit achieves this self knowledge in the fully developed consciousness of the individual human being. The individual realizes himself as infinite spirit through his own particular life. God. – or what Hegel prefers to call Geist – is man and achieves self realization through man. God is not a transcendental, external force as conceived by the higher religions.

The self realization of the free will involves the deliberate alienation of the universal will from the particular. The universal will seeks a particular determinate content for its self realization. It goes into the world of particulars seeking the actualization of its own nature – namely freedom. Freedom is to be understood “as the free will which wills the free will” (Hegel 1979 sec 27).

The determinate content which the universal needs for its self realization is a system of purely rational laws and institutions. They constitute ‘ethical life’ (Sittlichkeit) and Hegel’s claim is that the ethical forms he specifies are demanded by the activity of pure reason (universal will) in its drive for self realization. The self determination of the universal will is the movement of pure reason in developing the rational forms of its own being out of itself. This Hegel calls “dialectical thought” the movement of the dialectic is powered in the sphere of practical reason by the alienation of pure reason in particular will and its attempt to find itself in such latitude. Movement occurs when there is a realization of the inadequacy of the initial unity of the universal and the particular. This initial conception is conceived by Hegel as that of “individuality”. It is a necessary element in the universal will’s self enfolding and must be preserved but the full attainment of freedom requires the development of a larger whole – a “community” (the sphere of the operation of purely rational laws and institutions). When particular men come to pursue their lives as means to the realization of the universal in them, as embodied in the rational laws and institutions of the community “the will is then universal because all restriction and all particularity has been absorbed within it”. The metaphysical assumption underlying this vision is that of the unity of the universal and the particular will. The particular will is the human individual realizing the absolute value inherent in himself as a free being and thus overcoming particularity and finitude.

In the Philosophy of Right Hegel seeks to identify existents embodying the free will. Hegel calls such existents Right. What are fully adequate forms of Right?

To begin with Hegel endorses the individualist conception of right: the right of individuals to appropriate the world as an essentially and immediately free singular personality – this is the right of (capitalist) property. This right of property and contract is regarded as a necessary element in the free will’s self realization. Other individualist rights are also endorsed on the grounds that the free universal will can be objectified only through the wills of individuals who enjoy the whole range of the rights of persons, as conceived by individualist theories. However these rights are inadequate embodiments of the universal for the particular contents of the wills of persons are not determined by the universal. Thus Hegel argues there is no way in which a group of individuals whose particular wills are determined by their own interests can overcome their reciprocal externality. This cannot be overcome by contract. The common will it creates is only the contingent unity of particular wills (and not a universal will because a common self consciousness is not produced).

In order for freedom to be actualized the individual must not conceive himself as being immediately free (i.e. irrespective of the content of his particular will) but only in so far as he himself determines the content of his particular will in accordance with what is objectively good and universally valid – a will which so determines its' particular content is described as the 'moral will' (Hegel 1979 Sec. 107). But the objective good is external to the moral will which is the will of single individuals. The individual will aimed at the good cannot yield a substantive and objective content – hence the essential emptiness of the Kantian conception of the good will.

In the sphere of morality we are concerned with the rights of the individual, to determine the particular contents of his will (in accordance with the objective good) and to be held responsible only for what he has so determined. This right has a two fold aspect: it entails a right to welfare as well as the right of (capitalist) property and contract. The good, that is to be pursued (and in accordance with which the particular content of the will of the individual is to be determined) must balance (capitalist) property and welfare rights, since they necessarily limit each other. Through the process of dialectical thought the subjective will recognizes itself as an embodiment of the universal. The subjective will wills the universal and chooses a particular life in accordance with the objective good which harmonizes the pursuit of abstract right (property) and welfare for all. Hence the self realization of free will as the subjective will pursuing a particular good is identical with the realization of the good of a whole i.e. a community. Thus the self realization of free will is the self realization of the will of a community in the determination of its good in a system of balanced property and welfare (capitalist) rights but only in and through the wills of its individual members. The individual is free to the extent to which he can see himself as the vehicle for the existence of this system. The freedom and individuality of a person consists in his grasping in his existence a consciousness of the unity of absolute value with particular life.

The objective ethical order which alone is permanent contains three purely rational institutions: family, civil society and state. Each of these institutions embody the unity of the objective order of the community with the subjective wills of its members. This is most clearly evident in the family, where the individual does not distinguish his own particular aim from the good of the family and seeks to realize them. But the particular family cannot suffice for the full personal development of the individual. For this there is the institution of civil society in which the abstract right of the particular (the right of capitalist property) has its fullest development – the good of the whole is not present in the consciousness of its members who pursue their private end (although in co-operation with each other).

For the adequate conceptualization of the relation of particular individuality to the whole the development of a state is necessary. The state is the whole community – “the actuality of concrete freedom (where) personal individuality achieve(s) complete development and pass (es) over of (its) own accord into the interest of the universal and knows and wills the universal” (Hegel 1979 Sec. 260).

The individual sees the realization of his particular ends as the realization of universal ends in the state. Hegel idealized the Bismarkian state, although he did not go so far as to assert its infallibility or immortality. Its structures showed the way towards the achievement of perfect harmony between the particular and the universal but actual freedom can only be grasped in the theoretical realm of the pure self activity of dialectical thought and not in the course of world history and the actual empirical development of the state. The unity of the particular and the universal wills cannot be grasped in practice – Hegel concedes this to Kant and we may note in anticipation that Hegel was less of an idealist and less of an optimist than was Marx.

Marx criticizes Hegel for restricting freedom – the harmonization of particular and universal interests – to the level of the state. In the ideal communist society the state withers away and private property is totally abolished i.e. civil society is liquidated. These twin “witherings” are essential for the absorption of the particular into the universal – the becoming of man into a species being. This is the central ethical idea of communist society (see Appendix 2).

Marx takes his conception of species being from Feuerbach who argued that “the true object of infinite value is man and what he worships in God or Pure Reason is his species’ own essential powers”(Feuerbach 1954 p117). It is the species which creates the individual. The species is unlimited-for ever conquering nature, surmounting limits-and immortal. However in capitalist society man is alienated from his species because he is alienated from his productive activity as expressive of his essential powers. The abolition of ‘private’ property, allows for “the reappropriation of the species essence by man and the return of man out of religion, family, state etc. into his human i.e. social being”. Marx rejects the view that there is separation in the human being’s conception of his individuality and his sociability. “However much he is a particular individual, man is just as much the ideal totality, the subjective existence of society as something thought and felt. (Marx 1967 p150). The individual’s particularity is merely in terms of its being a particular mode of existence of the species or of social life.

This leads to the very important conclusion that for Marx (as for Feuerbach) individual self consciousness is unproblematic. Now self consciousness is problematic. To possess individuality man must become conscious of his single existence as a self constituted whole separate both from the Creator (Allah) and other created beings. The problem of individuality is the problem of determining the value of one’s individual existence in terms of one’s relationship with God and other creatures. In the Christian conception this problem is “solved” by postulating the immediate unity of the finite and the infinite (the human and the divine) in the person of Christ. Liberalism builds its theory of democracy and justice on the belief that every individual is Christ. Every individual is of objective value. There is an immediate inseparable unity of the absolute value that is present in man as such with the value that is present in

each and every individual. This value resides in the “life plan” formulated by self determining autonomous individuals and the social good is a concatenation of these individual life plans – each of which are of equal value. Hence in the liberal conception individuality is understood as the particular beings’ consciousness of himself as of objective value identical with his consciousness of himself as a specie being.

Hegel and Marx accept the liberal belief in the divinity of humanity (this is based on Kant’s metaphysical theory) but deny that the individual to be conscious of himself needs to constitute himself as an end by separating himself from society. such separation / alienation is the process through which spirit or dialectical thought uses the individual as a vehicle for the realization of the absolute good which is nothing but the species will. In communist (unalienated) society individual ends are ipsofacto social/specie ends and there can be no conflict between them. Communism, therefore necessarily denies all forms of particularity-family , civil society, state-and in this sense can be described as empty of moral content. Morality consists of revolutionary practice in capitalism aimed at heightening individual consciousness of man’s social ends. Once permanent revolution is transcended (at the end of the era of the dictatorship of the poletariat) morality too must wither away. Communist man faces neither scarcity nor evil. He behaves as he behaves because the scientific truth on how to maximize individual and social happiness stands fully revealed. There is as little possibility of denying this truth as of denying that two plus to make four.

Is Marx an individualist? Some Marxists such as Tucker and Gould and Kameneka would affirm this view and no-one can deny that freedom is the central value of the Marxist doctrine “the category which serves to unify Marxist theories of history and nature” (Gould 1980 p.182). Even Croce and Hilferding who interpret Marx as essentially an unethical thinker cannot deny that to Marx man is not the product but the creator of social relations and that abstract social forces-technology, class struggle-have no causal status independent of human activity. Freedom of course presupposes similarity or Equality and the Marxist ethical system necessarily enshrines this value: equality characterizes the era of the dictatorship of the proletariat and is the means for the elimination of differentiation and particularity in the communist heaven.

Freedom and equality are thus the common values of liberalism and socialism. Liberalism asserts that the good of the state consists in the maximum individual freedom of every member and in the equal valuing of their individual life plans: society is a concatenation not an ordering of individual ends and social justice requires that each be provided equal opportunity for the pursuit of his ends with special care being taken to ensure that the relative disadvantage of the poorest section of society is gradually reduced over time. This is the view of Rawls (1971), modern liberalism’s most noted political philosopher and may also be regarded as a consensual view. It will be readily seen that this common acceptance by liberalism and socialism of freedom and equality as the ultimate value is rooted in the common Kantian origins of these two doctrines. Both liberalism and socialism accept the Kantian conception of man as a self determining being. Liberalism asserts that separation of phenomenal and nomenal wills identified by Kant is illusory: the nomenal self is merely a concatenation of individual phenomenal wills. Socialism argues that the duality of the nomenal and the phenomenal wills is overcome in history with the coming

into being of the perfect society where scarcity is abolished, evil and good is impossible and every man is God.

Liberalism and socialism differ not in terms of absolute values or ends but about the means for the realization of these absolute values. What is desired above all is freedom and equality as a means for the realization of freedom. The liberals from Locke to Rawls believe that social arrangements which permit the individual to pursue his life plan and expand the social opportunity for him to do so are ideal for the realization of freedom and equality. Marx and other socialists argue that these social arrangements increase inequality, inhibit material progress and make freedom impossible for subordinate classes. The realization of freedom requires the abolition of all differentiation and particularities especially those associated with the existence of 'private' property. The dictatorship of the proletariat integrates the life plan of individuals into a comprehensive social (national) plan and is an instrument for overcoming the material conditions which make alienation necessary. A people who respond to the Marxist da'wah do not abandon the Enlightenment/Romantic values of freedom and equality. They reject merely the liberal doctrine that realization of these values requires marketised, social arrangements. They put their belief in the Marxist claim that the dictatorship of the proletariat and comprehensive social planning are necessary means for the achievement of freedom and equality. The acceptance of this claim has historically been falsified in Russia and East Europe and China by a number of factors. The single most important of these is the fact that the realization of liberal freedom requires a high level of material development-an abundance of wealth which calls forth avarice and greed and dissolves communitarian ties. Individuals in societies, which responded positively to the Marxist message, did not have highly differentiated "life plans" and their history and their culture prepared them for participation in a social revolution which promised expanded social opportunities and heightened social consciousness, as a means for self realization. The emphasis which socialism lays on this strengthening of communitarian ties establishes a natural affinity between its teachings and that of nationalism.

The success of a socialist revolution and the establishment of a communist regime does lead to a subjugation of the market by the plan and to the abolishing of private property. But private property is also abolished by the operation of the money and the capital markets and Lenin (1962) himself – not just Bernstein, Otto Bauer and Bukharin took note of this fact. Abolition of private property – whether through the plan or through the financial markets – establishes the social hegemony of capital, which is neither a social process nor a stock of money by a vice, takkathur.

Our master Maulana Muhammad Marmouduke Pickthall (may Allah exalt his heavenly status) defined takkathur as "rivalry in worldly increase" (1959 p473). This formulation captures the twin vices of avarice (accumulation) and covetousness (competition). Men who are avarice and jealousy obsessed necessarily surrender to the representatives of capital for the representatives of capital – whether 'private' corporate managers or communist delegates – are the true representatives of a freedom worshipping people. In such a society the dominant rationality must be the rationality of capital – for however surplus is produced and appropriated accumulation for its own sake alone guarantees abundance. A communist revolution leads to a change in the structure of capitalist order. It does not lead to an overthrow of capitalist order for liberalism and communism are routes to the same end – the state of

abundance in which man proclaims his divine right to will what he wills and to reign as the sole sovereign lord of the universe.

#### **Summary: Marxist Social Theory and Capitalism**

- × Legitimizing and providing a governance technology for capitalism is the telos of all sociological theoretical schools
- × Despite Habermas' criticism of positivistic sociological approaches and his emphasis on adopting phenomenology and interpretive approaches for understanding the symbolically structured domain of sociology, he sought an integration between 'explanatory' and interpretative theories. He found functionalism useful in understanding the objective interconnection of social action. Interpretative accounts can complement functionalist analysis by providing space for a recognition of 'repressed' needs.
- × Habermas' view of a historically oriented theory of society and reconstructing it with respect to specific anticipated futures is not dis-similar to that of orthodox sociologists such as Weber. Interpretivists and phenomenologists mainly "deepen" sociological analysis. Habermas uses psychoanalysis as a model for integrating functionalism and interpretive approaches and ethno methodology.
- × Habermas can seek such an integration and find something of value in all sociological schools because he accepts norms, processes and transaction structures of capitalism as rational. Marxist theory is the Enlightenment inspired paradigm which claims to reject the rationality of capitalist order.
- × In Marx's view the irrationality of capitalism emerges from the 'private' appropriation of surplus produced by labour in the form of surplus value. Abolition of private property and market relations is necessary for eliminating alienation and the achievement of a state of abundance.
- × According to Marx capitalism is irrational because capitalist relation of production obstruct the achievement of abundance. The achievement of abundance is accepted as an objective by Marx.
- × Marx rejects the classical / neo classical analysis of capitalist relations of production as technical means for the maximization of efficient production.
- × The determination of exchange value (value for others) in markets has social foundations under capitalism. It gives labour a value form which ensures that needs can only be met by producing value (for others) and appropriating value (produced by others). Abolition of this value form is transcending capitalism according to Marx.
- × The abolition of capitalist relations of production (the embodiment of labour in the value form) is necessary for the universalisation of freedom. Capitalist social relations constrain freedom by requiring isolated individuals to participate in the transformation of labour into the value form as the only means for the satisfaction of their needs. Capitalist relations are relations between: propertied and 'propertyless' (unequal and unfree) individuals.
- × Capitalist crises according to Marx reflect the production relation's incompatibility with realizing abundance. This is because in capitalism production is a means for the generation of surplus



value and not a means for the satisfaction of needs. Indeed according to Marx increased production of surplus value is usually accompanied by increased deprivation for the workers. The labourer loses his substantive freedom and equality by separation from and subjection to capitalist property.

- × In capitalist society the individual is not able or free to define his self interest because he is forced to transform his labour into values and is part of a class. Capitalist institutions – property, money, etc. – are not natural / rational but designed to serve the interests of the bourgeoisie whose quest for maximizing surplus value creates increasing deprivation (unfreedom) for the proletariat.
- × Marx endorses the Enlightenment values of freedom and equality. He objects not to the production of surplus in ever increasing quantity but to its production in the form of value and surplus value. Marx is a materialist in that he accepts an increase in production as the primary cause of the transformation of social relations. Marxism seeks an abolition of the market and the “private” appropriation of surplus value for the achievement of freedom and abundance.
- × There are many similarities between Marxist and liberal visions of the ideal society (see appendix 2). Despite his acceptance of the dialectical methods and much else in Hegelian theory Marx has often been seen as an individualist. In communism all collectivities – family, class, nation, state – wither away and the individual is complete master of nature. Enlightenment values are fully realized in communist society.
- × A socialist revolution leads to a restructuring of capitalism not to its overthrow. The plan takes the place of the market and private property is abolished by the state rather than by the financial markets (as in capitalism). Abolition of private property establishes the social hegemony of capitalism in both liberal and communist regimes.
- × Capital is not a stock of money nor a social process. It is the vice of *takkathur*, the universalization of avarice and covetousness. Both liberal and communist societies are dominated by jealousy and greed – i.e. by capital. Both liberalism and communism are routes to the same end – abundance and freedom the worship of desire and the proclamation of man’s sovereignty and his rebellion against God.

## Chapter 4

### Legitimizing Capitalism: Islamization of Social Sciences

This chapter discusses the consequences of attempts to Islamise economics, political science and Marxist social theory. It argues that Islamic social scientists have accepted the value premises underlying economics political science and social theory and that the policies generated by addressing contemporary issues problems within the context of these Islamised social scientific paradigms are inherently capitalist and liberal. The Islamization of social science project thus creates the danger of submerging. Islam within Western theoretical and policy discourses and practices and ought therefore to be rejected.

#### 4.1. Islamic Economics and Maulana Taqi Usmani

The initiative to provide an Islamic economic justification for capitalism dates back to the early 1970s. Its leading exponents in those days were Najatullah Siddiqui at the Centre for Islamic Economics Jeddah, Khurshid Ahmad visiting professor at the King Abdul Aziz University and Umar Chapra of the Saudi Arabian Monetary Agency. The sub discipline of Islamic Economics was invented to justify Saudi polices.

In the 1980s, Prince Muhammad al Faisal led the Islamic banking movement to justify Arab integration into the imperialist financial system. The IMF and the World Bank were closely associated with the Prince's initiative. Sami at Darvish, a Director of the World Bank became the first President of Faisal's, Daral Maal al Islami. IMF researchers – Mohsin Khan and Abbas Merakhor – started providing apologies for Islamic finance in the professional literature. Within Pakistan, Ziauddin Ahmad and Fahim Khan played a similar role.

Islamic economics represents an attempt at legitimizing the ethics and institutions of capitalism. This becomes abundantly clear when we examine the technical writings of the Islamic economists. Invariably these scholars work within the neo classical paradigm. The "Islamic" consumer/producer/public policy maker is a welfare maximiser (like his neo classical compatriot) and the definition of his utility function is a task usually left to the faqihs (the neoclassical economists also depend upon the philosophers of utilitarianism to define individual and community welfare functions). Although the constraints within which utility maximization is sought by the Islamic economists are claimed to be uniquely Islamic this is of very little significance. For, the Islamic economists claim also that in the long run the elimination of interest, the introductions of Zakat etc. are necessary for the maximization of efficient production. The Islamic constraints thus appear in the guise of procedures which constrain short term utility maximization so that long term utility may be maximized. The Islamic economists are rule utilitarian and short term constraints turn out to be no constraints at all in the long run.

This methodological similarity necessitates that the ethics of capitalism – acquisitiveness, competition, primacy of material well being, freedom, equality – are all endorsed by Islamic economics. Islam is seen not as a distinct civilization but as a means of reforming capitalism. Capitalism is criticized not for the ends it sets itself but for failing to achieve a "balance" in the attainment of legitimately conflicting ends

(acquisitiveness vs cooperation, freedom vs equality etc) Islam can achieve such a balance if we formally eliminate interest and introduce Zakat.

Now the ruling elites of the Muslim world realize that the introduction of Zakat and the introduction of Shariah compliant financial contracts replicating interest based transactions within capitalist financial markets represent no more than marginal policy changes. Often this is a small price to pay for co-opting potentially trouble some Islamic parties and for diverting revolutionary energy into reformist politics. Nimeri, Ziaul Huq and Mahathir have used this tactic with advantage and all three have found Islamic economists to be good and faithful servants. General Musharraf is probably not unsympathetic to the Islamic economists.

In most Muslim countries – Afghanistan, Algeria, Indonesia, the Indo Pak subcontinent, Iran – the resistance to imperialism during the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries was led by Islamic groups and scholars. These groups kept aloof from the reformist and apologist movements because there was an instinctive realization on their part that the difference between Islam and Western savagery was qualitative in nature. Islam was not a means for reforming capitalism but for annihilating it. The Islamic groups thus developed into popular movements with a capacity to challenge the continued dominance of the West and the Western educated elites that inherited power after independence. The social project of the Islamic movements was to develop an alternative to capitalism and to highlight the injustices that could not be redressed within this system.

Islamic economics has proved to be an important means for changing this social orientation of the Islamic parties. In Pakistan, the Arab world, Turkey, Malaysia and Indonesia many Islamic groups are now firmly allied to various factions of the politically dominant Western oriented elite. The economic platform of many Islamic parties is dominated by Islamic economic themes. Introduction of Shariah compliant financial contracts and the effective introduction of Zakat are increasingly seen as the main measures to be advocated. The reformed capitalism of Islamic economics theory is increasingly accepted as the ideal Islamic economy.

Islamic parties in Pakistan, Turkey and the Arab world have never taken the task of defining their economic problematique very seriously. Islamic economics has become a major conceptual hurdle in the attempt to define both ideal types and the social processes through which over time these ideal types are to be approximated. The Islamic ghost of neo classical economic man conjured up by Islamic economics bears hardly any resemblance to the historical reality of individual economic motivation at the time of the Prophet (SAW). Utility and profit maximization was the concern neither of the individual consumer/producer nor the purpose of social organization. Islam articulated a religious ethic which firmly subordinated economic endeavour to the individual and social quest for spiritual upliftment. Economic activity was a means for achieving spiritual excellence and was strictly limited to ensure that it aided spiritual progress – the Prophet (SAW) did not save, invest or bequeath property. The values of Zuhd and Faqr were strongly emphasized by Islam.

Similarly, the Islamic conceptions of property and of justice are rooted in a metaphysics that is at odds with the metaphysical conceptions underlying capitalism. Thus Rawls (the leading liberal political philosopher of modern times) builds his theory of justice on the Kantian conception of the individual as a self-determining being. Justice, within the Rawlsian system entails the creation of a social order in which individuals can pursue their autonomously defined ends and constraints in this pursuit of individual ends are justified on only two grounds.

- (a) That they are necessary to preserve the similar liberty of other individuals and
- (b) That they are required to compensate the most socially disadvantaged group (the so called difference principle).

It follows that in the Rawlsian system all individually valued ends are of equal social legitimacy. To give an example from Rawls himself the system of justice as fairness must treat as of equal value the conception of the good put forward by an individual who finds fulfillment solely in the counting of blades of grass and the conception of the good put forward by an individual who finds fulfillment in fighting drug abuse. Liberal conceptions of justice whether Kantian, or Rawlsian have no coherent argument for the ordering of values. All autonomously defined ends by self determining individuals are of equal value.

Now all the higher religions and most emphatically Islam reject the metaphysical conception of the individual as a self determining being (the conception of man as God) Islam insists that human fulfillment lies in a voluntary surrender (the word Islam means surrender) of the capacity of self determination. The capacity of self-determination is not denied but the authentication of ends with reference to this capacity leads one to Kufr and to frustration since such authentication cannot conceivably provide a basis for the ordering of values. The ordering of values and the authentication of ends cannot be achieved through an exercise of man's rational faculty. Reason can identify means for achieving given ends but it cannot provide a basis for valuing ends.

The Islamic conception of justice can assign intrinsic value only to the religious norms Iman, Islam, Taqwa and Ihsan. Islamic theorists thus face the task of conceptualizing a social and economic order in which the practice of the religious virtues (not welfare, not utility) are enhanced. Economic institutions have to be examined and their potential for inducing individuals to accord priority to the attainment of spiritual progress must be identified. The factory, the system of land tenure, the family as consuming unit, the distributive and marketing channels, the bazaar, the policy making and executing offices, saving and investment institutions all must be redesigned to facilitate the growth of virtue. This is essential to develop an economic system the purpose of which is the promotion of the religious virtues.

Islamic economics cannot of course raise such questions. It is a branch of neo classical economics and assumes the value neutrality of capitalist institutions. Adding on Zakat and introducing Shariah compliant financial contracts and other marginal adjustments such as reducing the maximum size of land holdings and guaranteeing trade union rights etc. would suffice for the achievement of Islamically

sanctioned welfare maximization. Islamic economics is methodologically incapable of exploring the relationship between institutional structure, individual motivation and value change. In the Islamic economics paradigm the individual consumer, producer, policy maker is assumed to be Islamically motivated and the problem of the impact of economic activity on individual motivation is thus assumed away. Instead of addressing this vital issue Islamic economists accept capitalist values, structures and organization forms as natural. This becomes clear when we look at the work of Maulana Taqi Usmani on Islamic finance.

Since the 1990s, a group of Deobandi Ulema led by Moulana Taqi Usmani, Vice President Dar-ul-Uloom Karachi has presented arguments justifying capitalist practices on Islamic grounds. This initiative enjoys the support of American and European banks which have established Islamic financing subsidiaries under the guidance of these Deobandi ulema in several Arab countries.

“Islam Aur Jadeed Maeshat-o-Tijarat” has been published by Dar-ul-Uloom Karachi and written by Moulana Taqi Usmani. Several editions have appeared since 1993. The book was written for the purpose of “providing Ulema and Fuqaha with a knowledge of modern economic and commercial concepts so that they can issue fatawa on economic and commercial issues” (p.6). The Islamic authenticity of this book is much greater than that of the Islamic economics literature produced by Najatullah Siddiqui, Omar Chapra and Prof. Khurshid. While these texts gather dust on the bookshelves Moulana Usmani’s slim volume has become compulsory reading for higher level (darja takhasus) students in many madaris all over Pakistan and India.

The Smithian roots of Usmani’s thinking is evident in his conception of the nature and scope of economics. “All economic thinking accepts that resources are limited and human needs unlimited and the central question is how to fulfill unlimited needs with limited resources” (p.19). Thus according to Usmani, scarcity is the fundamental economic problem as Smith teaches “Economics is concerned with the maximum satisfaction of needs and the fundamental problems of all economic systems are (a) determination of priorities (b) allocation of resources (c) distribution of income (and) (d) growth” (Usmani 1993 p20-21). The natural law philosophy which underlies Smith’s conception of the economic problem (presented in the Theory of Moral Sentiments) is thus implicitly endorsed by Usmani.

The endorsement of natural law philosophy is also evident in Usmani’s conception of the “laws” of supply and demand. “There are many natural laws operative in the universe which always produce similar results – one such natural law is the law of supply and demand” (Usmani p22). If the “law of demand and supply” is accepted as natural, the Smithian (originally Physiocrat) conception of the harmony of individual and social well being is inescapable. “Although every individual works for his own profit but the natural laws of supply and demand force him to fulfill the needs of society. The laws of supply and demand determine priorities and the pattern of resource allocation” (Usmani p23). This leads Usmani to a justification of preferences as value determinants (on the basis of a manifestly absurd marriage centric discourse (p 32-33)) and an implicit rejection of the subordination of preferences to moral values (p32).

In essence, Usmani's book provides a wholesale endorsement of capitalism. "The basic philosophy underlying capitalism is correct in that it identifies the law of supply and demand and the profit motive as the mechanisms for (effectively) addressing the fundamental economic problem (of scarcity), because this reflects natural human propensities" (Usmani p 35). Like Smith, Usmani's only criticism of capitalism is the emergence of monopoly. "Monopoly obstructs the functioning of the natural law of supply and demand. The price system is distorted and the fundamental economic problems (allocation, distribution, growth) are not addressed in a manner which reflect social needs and priorities" (Usmani p36).

The book argues that "economic problems should mainly be solved by the law of supply and demand (but) the operation of the profit motive should be limited by considerations of hallal and haram, (refusal) to constrain individual profit (with reference to) hallal and haram renders the natural laws of supply and demand non operational" (Usmani p 37) and leads to the emergence of monopoly.

According to the book, "Islam does not possess an economic system of its own. The Quran and hadith have not articulated any economic philosophy or economic system in the sense in which we comprehend these concepts today. Islam endorses the market forces and accepts that the natural law of supply and demand should be the basis for addressing the economic problem (of allocation, distribution and growth)" (Usmani p38). "Islam also fully endorses the profit motive as a basis for economic behavior" (Usmani p39).

State intervention in the economy is also justified on the Smithian grounds of correcting market failure. "The government has the right to restrict activity which disturbs (price) equilibrium in the public interest" (Usmani p41). This will prevent the growth of monopoly and allow a person "to sometimes express a preference for gain in the hereafter" (Usmani p43). However, "the Shariah has not given any mandatory order obliging him to do so" (Usmani p43). Hence, the determining principle with reference to allocation, distribution and growth will remain the profit motive as articulated in the operationalization of the "natural" laws of supply and demand. Islam endorses the profit motive on growth stimulation grounds (Usmani p48). According to Usmani it also recognizes the classical factors of production and justifies their remuneration in accordance with market principles (Usmani p46-51).

This leads to a wholesale and comprehensive (almost totally unqualified) endorsement of the capitalist property form. This endorsement takes the form of an apology for most stock market practices currently prevalent in Pakistan.

- The legal fiction of corporate personality is endorsed. The Wakf, sections of the Bait-ul-Mall, Tarka and Khaltash Shio are theorized as capitalist legal personalities. "the concept of legal personality is not forbidden: nor is this a strange conception for Islamic Sharia-only this terminology is new" (Usmani p81).

- The concept of limited liability is justified with reference to the principles of modaraba and the practice of “abd ma zum fit tijarah” – the company is like the slave who trades on behalf of his master and liability is limited to the sale price of the slave (Usmani p81-82).
- Share trading is justified on the basis of the view that share values represent the value of the tangible assets of the companies whose shares are being traded. Trade in shares is justified when share value exceeds face value – this excess value is presumed to represent the value of non-financial assets of the company (Usmani p81-87).
- Dealing in shares of companies involved in Riba transactions is justified provided the share holder protests against such transactions at the annual general meeting of the company whose shares he holds (Usmani p87-88). This justification holds even if there is not the remotest possibility that this protest can ever be effective (Usmani p88).
- Accepting dividend income is justified provided the amount of dividend attributable to the interest income of the company is given as sadaqa (without niyyah of sawab).
- Speculative transactions are justified on the grounds that motives should not be involved in considering the permissibility of transactions. “Anything considered permissible for trade cannot be proscribed merely on grounds of transactional motives – speculation is not haram – it is involved in all transactions: All spot transactions are permissible whether or not the motive is speculation” (Usmani p90-91).

As far as money market transactions are concerned the book adds little to the conventional wisdom of the Saudi inspired Islamic economists – Nejatullah, Chapra and Prof. Khurshid. Moreover, there are serious factual errors in this section – the IMF is described as the world’s central bank (Usmani p100) and the IBRD is seen to be the World Bank – not one of its constituents (Usmani p102). The credit/money creation process is described without reference to the reserve operations of the central bank (Usmani p123-126).

Usmani’s book calls for an expansion of the Islamic financing instruments – profit sharing, Modarbas, leasing, murabaha, rent sharing etc. It is shown that most asset and liability side transactions can be restructured on the basis of Islamic financing contracts, within an interest based system (Usmani p126-158). The need for a systemic abolition of interest is not seen as a prerequisite for the Islamisation of bank depository or lending practices – indeed the book does not call for an abolition of the money market but basis its recommendations essentially on the existing practices of Islamic banks which (with the partial exemption of Iran) function exclusively within interest based financial systems.

The compatibility of such financial restructuring with capitalist practice is explicitly recognized by Usmani. No resistance is expected from foreign lenders – “(foreign) lenders are concerned with profit not with how these profits are realized ..... The IMF and the World Bank are conducting research on Islamic financing and supportive research papers are being published. The International Finance Corporation (IFC) is now voluntarily structuring transactions with Islamic banks within Islamic financing

modes. In this situation, Islamic countries can easily conduct international financial transactions on the basis of Islamic financing principles. This will not be difficult at all” (Usmani p170-171).

There are several harmful consequences of legitimizing capitalist practice in this manner.

First the grotesque distortion of capitalist reality, which such Islamic justification projects is ideally suited to serve imperialism’s ideological needs. Capitalism’s claims to be a natural spontaneously evolved (Hayekian) system are fully endorsed. Economic justice is seen to be a function of the operation of competitive markets reflecting rational (utility / profit maximizing) choices of isolated individuals whose behaviour is determined by the “natural” commitment to the profit motive and utility maximization.

This abstracts/extracts capitalist rationality from its vicious, corrupt, unjust and morally debased historical context. Capitalism has not evolved spontaneously in response to the unfolding of natural laws governing human behaviour. Natural law philosophy has been discredited centuries ago. There are no non-physical natural laws governing human behaviour –there are only laws revealed by Allah or laws made by man. Imam Ghazali has conclusively demonstrated this in his chapter on knowledge in the Ihya.

The law of demand and supply is not a “natural law”. Researchers in price history have consistently failed to find evidence for the existence of this law in pre-capitalist times (Agleitta research on seventeenth, century France for example). Market equilibrium is a fiction as mathematical chaos theory has demonstrated. Chaos theorists have shown that in the real world markets do not adjust to create a unique stable equilibrium of price and output configurations. The concept of market clearance and unique stationary market equilibrium has been rejected even by Kenneth Arrow. He has shown that even without external disturbances permanent large patternless oscillations are the norm in competitive markets. Neo classical theory survives today only because it serves the ideological needs of capitalism – the ‘laws’ of supply, demand, equilibrium are the Father, the Son and Holy Ghost of the ontology underlying capitalist economics.

Men are not now – nor have they ever been –naturally profit motivated or utility maximizing. Capitalism deliberately promotes the vices of avarice and covetousness to universalize profit and utility maximizing behavior. To accept such behavior as natural is to misunderstand the epistemological status of economics (and political economy). Economics is not a ‘science’ but the religion of capitalism based on the absurd doctrine of the unlimitedness of wants. Anti capitalist authors, such as Maulana Maududi have developed their critique of capitalism on a rejection of this doctrine. In his *Insan Ka Ma’ashe Masala aur uska Islami hal* (first published in 1941). Maulana Maududi shows that limiting human wants is necessary for the promotion of the Islamic way of life and of Islamic virtues such as faqr, zuhd, istighna and infaq. Unlike the apologists Maulana Maududi insists that Islam is a fully articulated economic system intrinsically incompatible with capitalism (Maududi 1941 p.17-31, 42-60).



Accepting the doctrine of the unlimitedness of wants is first and foremost an attack on Islamic spirituality – it is natural that Islamic economics originally enjoyed the patronage of the Saudis, who severely constrain spiritual practice. Accepting wants as unlimited is justifying capitalism's terrible history- its wanton slaughter of fifteen million Red Indians, its revolt against theology, its shocking moral depravity and sexual anarchy, its abuse and neglect of children, women and specially the elderly – as natural. It is to deny the relevance of moral/spiritual evaluation of economic practices. The attempt to Islamise capitalist finance takes a huge step in this direction. It thus paves the way for de spiritualization of economic life and the westernization of commercial culture in Muslim countries.

Secondly, the Islamic finance movement also paves the way for the subordination of the Islamic world to global capital. This is achieved by the legitimization of capitalist property. Islamic finance does not recognize that capitalism, like socialism abolishes private property – socialism does this through the state, capitalism through the financial markets. Legal personhood, limited liability, the separation of ownership from control, determination of values on the basis of speculation, distancing of finance from production, the use of the interest rate as the key refinance price – all these are moments in the circuit of capital which necessitate the abolition of private property and the subordination of all agents – managers, workers, rentiers – to capital itself. The functioning and institutional structuring of capital and money markets ensures that capital accumulation becomes an end in itself-the *raison d'être* of all economic activity. Contrary to Maulana Usmani's assumption, share values do not reflect asset worth (he justifies share transactions on this basis), asset prices are determined by the speculative activity that overwhelmingly determines share values. In practice the company is not a slave (*abd ma zum fit tijarah*) but a representative of capital, the real master ruthlessly subordinating all economic agents – managers, workers, rentiers – to its will.

Establishing the hegemony of capital is a necessity for capitalism. It is necessary for the universalization of the vices of avarice and covetousness (*takkathur*). Islamic finance legitimizes the universalization of these vices by misrepresenting the price formation process in capitalist markets. It does not recognize that removing moral restraint on individual behaviour – legitimizing accumulation – turns competition into an instrument for the promotion of oligopoly. Today prices in virtually all major commodities and factor markets are administered prices – supply and demand are routinely managed and administered by the handful of companies which dominate these markets. Non monopolistic competition exists only in markets, which are as yet untouched by capitalist finance and property. The standard economics text books set out the perfect competitive model as an ideal to which monopolists/oligopolists are supposed to aspire. This is a deliberate, ideological distortion of the historical reality whereby competitive markets once freed of moral restraints become instruments for the domination of capital – the just price can be formed only in a market regulated to ensure the dominance of the will of God and the promotion of the Islamic virtues.

Endorsing capitalist price formation processes and property forms legitimates the incorporation of Muslim business in imperialist corporate structures. The Islamic finance initiatives of Prince Faisal subordinated European based Islamic banks to imperialist finance. Today a merger and acquisition wave is sweeping through the financial and the telecommunication and media (TMT) sectors. Banks such as ABN Amro, Citibank and Standard Chartered are skillfully using Islamic finance techniques to

subordinate Gulf finance institutions and to capture a potentially lucrative niche market. Privatization initiatives in this region will also involve the use of Islamic finance instruments. Ulema on the board of multinational banks and firms will serve a useful purpose by legitimizing Muslim business subordination to imperialist finance on Islamic grounds.

Thirdly, subordination is of course not to be limited to the private sector. Legitimizing capitalist finance provides an ideological basis for subordinating Muslim states to America. Cutting back of state expenditure, sale of precious national assets to foreigners at rock bottom prices, dismantling trade policies, opening information floodgates to the imperialist media, all this will be a natural consequence of the Islamic legitimization of subordination to imperialist finance. No wonder the IMF and the World Bank have always been enthusiastic supporters of the Islamic finance movement.

Islamic finance seeks to enlist the support of the Ulema for capitalism. This attempt will not succeed for the Islamic rejection of capitalism is based on moral – not materialist – premises. Accepting the unlimitedness of wants negates the mainstream orthodox stance in Islamic thought and history Islam – unlike socialism-recognizes capitalism as intrinsically evil. Capitalism is evil because of the goal it sets for itself-universal freedom-not because it fails to achieve this goal.

#### **Summary: Islamic Economics and Capitalism**

- Islamic economics is a Saudi project (Nejatullah, Khurshid, Chapra, were Saudi employees.)
- Islamic economics legitimises capitalist ethics and institutions. Islamic economists work within the neo classical paradigm. Policies are justified in terms of utility/profit maximization within Islamic constraints but these constraints are seen as necessary for maximizing long run utility/profit Islamic economists are ride utilitarians.
- Islamic economics endorses acquisitiveness/competition and criticizes capitalism for not achieving a balance between freedom and equality. Islam is seen as a means for reforming capitalism through introduction of Zakat and Sharia compliant financial contracts. This can co-opt Islamic, movements into liberal capitalist regimes. Islamic economics legitimizes abandonment of the revolutionary struggle to overthrow capitalism.
- The economic agenda of the Islamic parties has become indistinguishable from that of liberal and social democratic parties. This agenda does not recognize that the sahaba did not seek profit or utility maximization. Islamic policy subordinates economic to spiritual ends, zuhd, tawakkal and Faqr are strongly emphasized by Islam.
- Islamic conception of justice (unlike Rawls) does not recognize all moral ends as of equal value. Ends are not authenticated with reference to self determination but in terms of the promotion of religiously sanctioned virtues. Economic institutions and practices are valued on this basis and not on the basis of utility/profit maximization. Islamic economics cannot do this for it's methodology is incapable of explaining the relationship between institutional structure, individual motivation and value change as it is committed to utility/profit maximization.

- Islamization of capitalist values and institutions is reflected in Taqi Usmani's work.
- Smithian roots of Usmani's work reflected in acceptance of:
  - × Scarcity and unlimitedness of wants
  - × Natural law (i.e. laws of demand and supply)
  - × Social interests are served by individuals seeking self interest
  - × Values should be determined on the basis of individual preferences
  - × "Basic philosophy underlying capitalism is correct"
  - × Only criticizes monopoly
- According to Usmani Islam does not possess an economic system. Preferences should be taken as given Shariah does not require man to have specific preferences.
- Usmani legitimizes the capitalist property form
  - × Corporate personality and limited liability is justified.
  - × Share trading, (the value of the shares are expected to be equal to the value of the assets of the company) is also justified.
  - × Dealing in shares of company involved in Riba transactions is legitimized.
  - × Accepting riba based dividends is justified.
  - × Speculative transactions on a spot basis whatever the motive of the trade are permissible.
- Usmani does not suggest the abolition of the money market but seeks to show that interest free banks can work in an interest based system Citi, World Bank/IMF support this stance.
- Such an approach distorts capitalist reality. Capitalism has not evolved spontaneously but through the violent seizure of power by evil men.
- This approach accepts natural laws and natural law philosophy. Imam Ghazali shows there are no natural laws – only laws revealed by God or laws made by man. Laws of demand/supply not natural Markets do not produce equilibrium (Chaos theory) capitalism promotes avarice/jealousy.
- Accepting wants as unlimited is rejecting spirituality.
- Islamic economics legitimizes the values of capitalism Islamic subordination to global capital. It is legitimizing capitalist property growth in the Muslim world and submergence of the Muslim world within global capitalism.
- Islamic economics legitimizes avarice/covetousness and fails to recognize that price formation in markets dominated by avarice/jealousy is necessarily oligopolistic administered by a handful of companies.

- By advising multinational firms/banks Ulema are justifying Muslim subordination to imperialist finance and to the public order of global capital – i.e. America.

#### 4.2. Islamic Constitutionalism and Maulana Maududi

The greatest impact of modern political science on Islamic scholarship has been in the area of constitution making. I shall in this section briefly outline Maulana Maududi's legitimization of liberal theories and practices on Islamic grounds.

Maulana Maududi is a seminal figure in contemporary Islamic thought. His critically important contributions are:

- × His development of Shah Waliullah's conception of Islam as a complete, closed system and as the only universal civilization. It is on this basis that Maulana Maududi makes a distinction between Islam and Jahiliya<sup>xciii</sup>
- × His conceptualization of Jihad as a permanent revolutionary strategy and rejection of the view that Jihad is a defensive war for national liberation.
- × His total rejection of Western epistemology and insistence on the position that no new interpretation of Islam is needed to deal with contemporary problems and challenges<sup>xciv</sup>

Despite this insistence on Islam's completion and uniqueness Maulana Maududi endorses the use of liberal discourses and institutions as a political technology. His conception of "Islamic democracy" is of a political order in which "every individual is an equal participant in Khilafat and (in which) all individuals enjoy equal status as citizens" (Maududi 1990 p14)<sup>xcv</sup>. In Islamic order "every individual is Khalifa. All (individual) Khilafa delegate their powers of Khilafat to the formal ruler for administrative purposes" (1990 p140).

Maulana Maududi also finds room for personal autonomy within Islamic political order "within legal constraints every individual has full freedom to choose his way of life" (1990 p141). Endorsement of liberal values – autonomy and equality – leads to an endorsement of liberal institutions. "The President of the state must be elected by the Muslims... the election must reflect the free uncoerced will of the Muslims" (1990 p337,340). Maulana Maududi argues that a well defined and permanent shoora representative of the Muhajareen, the Ansar and allied tribes existed in the time of the Prophet (Salla Allah –o-Alehe-wa sallam) "(Members of the Shura of the Prophet, sallah Allah-o-alahe wa sallam) were chosen by a natural electoral process. They were true representatives of the Muslim tribes. Had elections of the modern type based on universal franchise<sup>xcvi</sup> been held the same people would have been elected....Had voting taken place there was no one else in the society who would have enjoyed the confidence of the Muslims. They thus joined the majlis-e-Shura through a process of natural elections. Thus in the era of the Prophet (Salla Allah-o-alahe-wa salam) the institution of the majlis-I-Shura had been established and the constitutional provisions for its continuous existence had also been formulated" (Maududi 1990 p346).

Maulana Maududi stresses the importance of representational democracy in the Islamic state. “The President must not consult any one he likes but only those who are the representatives of and enjoying the confidence of the ordinary citizens.... It is evident that the method for determining the representativeness of the members of the Shura that was applied in the time of the Prophet Salal Allah o alahe wa salam is no longer practical.... In the modern age (adult franchise based) elections are a permissible way for determining the representative character (of the members of the Majli-I-Shura)” (1990 p344).

According to Maulana Maududi ordinary citizens of the Islamic state “have the right to elect the President and to be members of its parliament” (1990 p352). He endorses the whole array of liberal and social democratic rights – life, property, consciousness, association, welfare<sup>xcvii</sup> (1990 p355-358). Maulana Maududi does not recognize human rights as a negation of huquq-ul-ibad – i.e. as duties of a capitalist state to foster capitalist individuality and civil society and universalize avarice and covetousness.

In Maulana Maududi’s view Islamic democracy is based upon “popular viceregency” (1990 p371) and “this necessarily implies that government be established by the will of the people and remains in power only while it enjoys popular support” (1990 p371). Thus kingship (mulukyat) cannot be legitimate in any circumstances (1990 p374) and a constitution sanctioning human rights provides the legal framework for the practice of ‘popular viceregency’ (190 p375). Popular viceregents’ – i.e. the elected representatives of the citizens have the right “to legislate within the constraints of the Shariah” (1990 p441). “The legislator should have specific characteristics<sup>xcviii</sup> but “he does not need to prove that he possesses them” (1990 p445). Such legislation and the existence of a legislature (Parliament) is seen as necessary for establishing the Islamic legitimacy of the state (Maududi 1990 p346).

The Islamic state is thus not a rejection of modern liberal democracy “but an intermediate stage and system of law and culture between theocracy and Western secular democracy” (Maududi 1990 p479). Like liberal democracy Islam accepts the principle that “establishment and change of government should be based on the will of the citizens... the state belongs to the ordinary citizen. It is run by a legislature elected on the basis of popular representation and enjoying the right to enact laws through consensus or majority decisions” (1990 p481). The Islamic revolution culminates in the establishment of the authority of such a legislature governing the state.

In sum Maulana Maududi provides legitimation for the establishment of a constitutional democracy in which Khilafat resides in a citizenry of individuals enjoying equal human and representational rights and governed by a parliament which legislates through consensual and majority decisions. This is certainly a new interpretation of Islamic political thought and it is not legitimated by references to the work of classical Islamic political thinkers such as Imam Mawardi, Imam Muhammad, Imam Ibne Khuldun, Imam Ghazali and Shah Waliullah (may Allah reward them and exalt their heavenly status). Quite the contrary Maulana Maududi’s political thought seems to draw upon the work of al Farabi a neo Aristotelian who

saw democracy as providing opportunities for the development of the sciences and arts necessary for the establishment of the 'virtuous regime' (Mahdi 2001 p144-146). A more direct inspiration of course is the work of Locke and Rousseau.

It is Locke who provides the key statement justifying representational liberal governance in opposition to the religious state established by the saintly Lord Oliver Cromwell. Rousseau's" conception of the general will is strongly influenced by Locke's treatise on representative government. Rousseau's conception of the general will as necessarily good in that it can not will evil draws upon Locke's view that divine law sanctions representational governance<sup>xcix</sup>. In the Lockean conception there can be no contradiction in the articulation of the commands of God and the directives of the will of the citizens. This is based on Locke's assertion that God does not mandate a particular political order and divine will in this respect had no particular content. The general will can be seen as an instrument for articulating divine will in a particular context<sup>c</sup>. Divine will can thus be interpreted as sanctioning the practical sovereignty of the citizen<sup>ci</sup> - though as Locke recognizes this cannot be proved by direct reference to the Bible.

In Maulana Maududi's view the general will of the people of Pakistan sanctions the supremacy of the divine will in the country's political order. In the Pakistani state divine will legitimately circumscribes the general will and makes it subservient to and constrained by the Shariah. In this conception divine will is not empty (as it is in Locke's thought). It legitimates the structuring of legitimate obediences and defines moral and social values. This concurrence between the dictates of divine will and those of the general will of the people of Pakistan is not theorized by Maulana Maududi in the sense that he does not show its necessity but takes it as an empirically observable fact. It is this fortuitous coincidence between the general will of the people of Pakistan and divine will which makes democracy an appropriate instrument for the Islamisation of Pakistan's political system.

Sustaining concurrence between the general will of the people of Pakistan and divine will is a crucial problem for Maulana Maududi, for divine will as articulated in Shariah has a specific content<sup>cii</sup>. Maulana Maududi does not justify his own scheme for the particular articulation of the general will within Pakistan in the form of a political system with reference to the historical experiences of the Muslims of the Indian subcontinent. Instead Maulana Maududi presents an abstract model based on his interpretation of some sources of the Shariah – he does not even justify his abstract model with reference to classical Islamic political thought.

The institutions Maulana Maududi sanctions – citizenship, human rights, the constitution, parliament – are not rooted in Islamic or Indian Muslim history. This implies that the political paractice of the Muslims of India has failed to articulate authentic Islamic norms and institutions and we are now able to do so only because of Maulana Maududi's theorizing<sup>ciii</sup>.

Electoral defeats since the Punjab elections of 1951 have shown that the people of Pakistan do not endorse the conceptualization of Islamic order as conceived by Maulana Maududi. The victory of the Awami League nationalists and the PPP secularists in 1970 showed clearly that there was no coincidence between the general will of the people of Pakistan and the divine will (at least as articulated in Maulana Maududi's thought) hence democracy could not be conceived as an instrument for the articulation of the pre existing concurrence between the two. Therefore the democratic process has since 1971 been seen as the process by which people can be convinced of the need to formulate a general will which is in concurrence with (Maulana Maududi's interpretation of) the divine will. To achieve this reformulation of the general will the Jama'at has sanctioned the politics of rights – the implementation of Islamic political order would lead to the provision of human and welfare rights and increased prosperity and progress. Islamic political struggle was thus reconceptualized as a quest for this worldly progress and welfare (not a quest for sacrifice and shahdat). In pre imperialist India struggling for rights was entirely alien to Muslim political culture. The Pakistan movement and the post 1970 political practise of the Jama'at-I-Islami has provided legitimation for the politics of rights and effectively closed the gap between politics of Muslim nationalism and the politics of Islamic revival.

Legitimation of the politics of rights has meant an endorsement of the values of competition (covetousness) and accumulation (avarice) and a downgrading of the need to foster the religious virtues through political struggle. The movement for establishing an Islamic state has effectively become a movement for reforming the liberal capitalist state. This illustrates that the strategy for using the democratic process as a means for creating a concurrence between the general will and divine will is practically a strategy for redefining the substantive content of the divine will in a manner which is acceptable to the people. The emphasis on human and welfare rights necessitates that the commands of the Shariah be implemented in a manner and to the extent acceptable to the people and an endorsement of capitalist values – competition (covetousness) and accumulation (avarice) – makes a reorientation of the general will impossible. The practise of democratic politics thus does not lead to a transformation of the general will but to a reinterpretation of the divine will for legitimating the politics of rights. Capitalist development inexorably secularizes society and fundamentalist movements (Hindu, Christian, Islamic) can provide legitimation for this secularization as both Binder (1983) and Euben (1999) have argued. Fundamentalist movements sanctioning the politics of rights are self destructive for they accept autonomous (i.e. capitalist) individuality as natural and not a product of the triumph of Enlightenment philosophy. Such religious movements thus do not seek a transcendence of capitalist individuality, civil society or of the capitalist state. They seek instead a reconciliation between the substantive content of religious teachings on the one hand and the arbitrarily willed preferences of the capitalist individual and the norms and structures of the capitalist system on the other.

Such religious movements reinterpret capitalism and seek to show that religious practices are effective means for the realization of capitalist norms and for the redressing of capitalist structural imbalances<sup>civ</sup>. While Maulana Maududi seeks to constrain capitalist and democratic practices by Shariah injunctions the political discourse of the Jama'at presents Shariah injunctions as effective means for the achievement of progress and the flourishing of human rights<sup>cv</sup>.

The essential significance of Maulana Maududi's work in contemporary Muslim thought emerges from his insistence on Islam as a complete system, his recognition of the West as jahiliya and his rejection of the need for a new interpretation of Islam to deal with contemporary issues and challenges. Maulana Maududi's, political writings however provide grounds for legitimating capitalist and liberal political values and structures and this frustrates the quest for systemic transformation and the transcendence of capitalist order. Thus Maulana Maududi's reinterpretation of capitalist political order must be rejected and the analyses of classical Muslim political thinkers – Imam Mawardi, Iman Ibn-e-Khuldun and Shah Waliullah in particular – must be revived for achieving Islamic political hegemony and the comprehensive and final annihilation of capitalist order.

#### **Summary: Islamic Constitutionalism and Capitalism**

- Maulana Maududi presents an Islamic legitimation of liberal norms and practices despite.
  - × his insistence that Islam is a complete, closed system and the only universal civilization.
  - × his conceptualization of jihad as a permanent revolutionary strategy.
  - × his rejection of the West as jahiliya khalisa
  - × his view that no new interpretation of Islam is required to deal with contemporary challenges
- Despite this Maulana Maududi endorses liberal discourses and institutions as a technology.
- He endorses
  - × concept of equal citizenship. Every individual is a participant in Khilafat.
  - × the Amir is the delegate of the true Khilafa (citizens)
  - × autonomy – every individual can choose his life pattern
  - × election of President and legislature by all citizens
  - × the legislature must consist of representatives of the citizens. According to Maulana Maududi such a representative parliament existed in the time of the Prophet (Sallal Allah-o-alahi-was-Sallam) and the Khulafa-i-Rahideen. Members of the Shura were naturally elected and would have been elected if there had been adult franchise.
- Constitutional provisions for the establishment of parliament were formulated in the time of the Prophet (Salal Allah-o-allahi-was Sallam). According to these provisions consultation must be limited to representatives of the ordinary people elected through a process equivalent to adult franchise.
- Maulana Maududi endorses the whole array of liberal rights – life, property, conscience, association, welfare.
- He does not recognize human rights as negation of huquq-al-ibad and duties of a capitalist state to sustain capitalist individuality and civil society.



- Islamic democracy is “popular viceregency”. This implies that government be established and retain power only by the will of the people. A constitution recognizing human rights provides the legal framework for popular viceregency.
- Representatives of the people have the right to legislate within the constraints of the Shariah.
- Ideally the legislator must be a faqih but he does not need to prove that he has the characteristics of a faqih to legislate.
- The Islamic state is “an intermediate stage” between theocracy and liberal democracy.
- The Islamic revolution is the establishment of a representative government and legislature which can enact law by majority with the citizenry enjoying equal human rights.
- This is certainly a new interpretation of Islamic political teachings and is not legitimated by reference to the work of our classical political thinkers. It has some affinity with the political thought of al Farabi who saw democracy as making possible the development of the sciences and the arts required for the establishment of a virtuous regime.
- It also draws heavily upon the thought of Locke and Rousseau. Locke justified representational regimes in opposition to religious regimes.
- Rousseau’s conception of the general will as necessarily good draws upon Locke’s view that God wills representative government and there is correspondence between divine will and the will of the citizens. The general will provides the substantive content of the divine will which is empty – God wills no political order.
- In Maulana Maududi’s view there is concurrence between the will of the people and divine will. Divine will is not empty. It has content and legitimately constrains the general will. This concurrence has been achieved fortuitously. This makes democracy an appropriate instrument for Islamisation.
- Maulana Maududi presents a general scheme for the articulation of the general will so as to sustain its concurrence with divine will. This scheme is not based on the historical experiences of Muslim India.
- He presents an abstract model based on his interpretation of political practise of the first Islamic state. This model legitimates citizenship universal suffrage equivalence, a representative parliament an elected executive and human rights. This model is not justified with reference to classical Muslim thought or Islamic history.
- This means that Muslim India has failed to articulate Islamic political norms and practices which have now been discovered by Maulana Maududi.
- But elections since 1951 show that the Pakistani people do not endorse this conception of political order and democracy has therefore been viewed as a process for convincing people to endorse Maulana Maududi’s conception of political order. Democracy could no longer be conceived as an instrument for articulating consensus between the general will and divine will.
- The general will thus has to be formulated. In practice this has involved an endorsement of the politics of rights. Islamic political struggle is reconceptualized as a means for worldly progress and welfare (not a quest for sacrifice / shadat). Politics of Islamic revival and Muslim nationalist politics

have come close by endorsing the politics of rights which has historically been alien to Muslim politics.

- Islamic revivalism thus endorses capitalist values – competition, accumulation. Islamic revivalism has become a movement for reforming liberal capitalism. This shows that using the democratic process as an instrument for achieving a concurrence between the general will and divine will is practically a project for redefining the substantive content of the divine will according to people's wishes.
- An endorsement of capitalist values makes a reformulation of the general will impossible and the implementation of the Shariah becomes subject to popular endorsement.
- Binder and Euben argue that fundamentalist movements which endorse the politics of rights legitimize secularization of society on religious grounds.
- Such fundamentalist movements are self destructive for they accept capitalist individuality as natural, not a product of Enlightenment thought.
- Such religious movements reinterpret capitalism and seek to show that religious practices are effective means for realizing capitalist norms and redressing capitalist structural imbalances Shariah is shown to be an effective means for the achievement of human rights and economic progress.
- Maulana Maududi's reinterpretation of capitalist political order cannot provide a basis for transcending capitalism and establishing Islamic political hegemony. This requires that we return to classical Muslim political thought.

#### 4.3. The Sociology of Islam and Allama Shariati

This section discusses the work of Dr. Ali Shariati a committed Islamic revolutionary trained as a sociologist at the University of Paris during the early 1960s, Shariati applied sociological theories – specially based on the works of Marx, Fanon, Toynbee, Uzgan and the authors of the French analytical and critical school of sociology – to Islamic themes. He conceives of Islam as “a median school” intermediate between capitalism and socialism (Algar 1978 p19).

Sahriati was also deeply influenced by his father. Aqai Taqi Shariati who sought to develop a “scientific and progressive” approach to theological questions and wrote a modern tafseer (Tafsir Naveen) challenging the interpretations of the traditionalist ulema. Ali Shariati inherited this approach and developed it into a third wordlist quasi. Marxist interpretation of Islamic social thought and practise. It is this insistence on Marxist themes which has enabled the Mujahideen-I-khalq to accept Shariati as their most important theoretician.

Shariati rejects Islamic history, consensus (ijmah) and theology as a source of Islamic social thought and practise. Shariati writes “we still do not know our religion ... we have not written a single worthwhile book concerning Ali and his companions ... after fourteen centuries Ali has been made known to us by a

Christian. Georges Jourdaq" (1979 p3). Shariati advocates a rejection of the entire corpus of Islamic knowledge accumulated through the centuries "we must begin by knowing our religion (through a new interpretation of the Quran) which (enabled me) to extract from the Qura'an a whole series of new.....themes relating to .... sociology and the new sciences. A philosophical theory and a theory of sociology and history opened themselves before me and when I checked them against sociology and history I found them to be fully correct" (1979-p6) – the Qura'an, according to Shariati, fully endorses modern sociological methodologies. "Though applying the special terms of the Quran it is possible to discover several new topics .... in sociology" (1979 p7) for the Quran endorses doxological methodology.

Reflection on the Quran leads Shariati to the conclusion that "the Prophet (Sallal Allah o alaihe was sallam) is not recognized as the active cause of fundamental change in human history and development. He is depicted (merely) as the bearer of a message" (1979 p13). Shariati identifies "the masses as constitute(ing) the fundamental effective factor of social change" (1979 p14). Shariati defines "al nass as the whole people" (1979 p14).

Reflection on the Quran also leads Shariati to accept the quasi Spensserian / quasi Lamarkian idea that "a society is like a living being... it has scientifically demonstratable and immutable laws.... society is answerable for its deeds before the Creator" (1979 p16-17).

Shariati describes "Islam as a scientific schools of sociology (which recognizes) man as equivalent to will and society as equivalent to norm, the combination of these two represent the median position .... Man is free but obliged to follow the laws of nature to realize this freedom" (1979 p19). Prophets do not create, they merely recognize pre existing social norms and "make use of their freedom to advance their aim" (1979 p20).

Shariati is contemptuous of the Middle Ages which failed to recognize that "Spirit had to develop in freedom" (1979 p21). He is full of praise for the "multifaceted and revolutionary European awakening in science, art, literature and all areas of human and social concern (which) ... resulted in the birth of the civilization and culture of today's world" (1979 p22). Understanding why this "revolution in thought" took place is according to Shariati "the most important question that science must answer" (1979 p22). According to Shariati there were two fundamental causes underlying this revolution, (a) the replacement of Aristotelian method of analogical reasoning by mechanistic / empiricist methodology and (b) the transition from feudalism to capitalism (1979 p22). Both of these transitions were a product of Islam's contact with Europe (1979 p23). Therefore we must follow in the footsteps of Europe and adopt the scientific method "Today is no time for the worship of what we do not know... belief is no virtue. We

must learn the scientific methods of Europe. In the investigation of religion new paths must be followed and a new method chosen, the method of sociology must be used" (1977 p4).

Shariati laments that "the study of the Quran and the study of Islamic history are very weak as they now exist in our corpus of Islamic studies" (1979 p26). He applauds the efforts of the revisionist Muhammad Abduh in pioneering Islamic modernism (1979 p26).

According to Shariati the application of the sociological method (he calls it typology) shows that the "Prophet of Islam, (Sallal Allah alaihe wa salam) struggle(ed) against the aristocracy, slave owners and merchants" (1979 p280) and that Imam Hussain stood for "life and liberty, thought and learning, power and liberty" (1979 p32). This role of the Prophet (Sallal Allah alaihe wa salam) and of Imam Hussain "was not clearly understood at the time of their appearance (but) has ..... become comprehensible with the development of human thought and science (Shariati 1978 p72)". "Islam is true humanism" (Shariati 1978 p75) for "man is not merely the viceregent of God upon earth but also His relative... The spirits of God and man both possess an excellence deriving from the possession of will. Man can act like God.... to a certain degree" (1978 p77). The "names" that Adam learnt are "the truths of science" inherent in the world "(1978 p78)". "In Islam man is not humbled before God. He is the partner of God" (1978 p80-81).

Shariati's humanism is presented in detail in his most well known book Islamshinasi (1984). The central theoretical concept elaborated here is tauhid defined as a "world view regarding the universe as a unity (combining) this world and the hereafter (possessing) a single form, a single living mechanism, will, intelligence, feeling and purpose. (The universe) is like a vast and absolute man. Take a man endowed with awareness, creativity and purpose..... enlarge Him to the utmost degree and we will have before us the world "(1987 p46-47). "God is the light of which the lamp is the world" God, nature and man, the origin of all three is the same. All have the same direction, the same will, the same spirit "(1978 p46-47). Knowledge of the world its signs and 'norms' is revealed by phenomenology, by physics, chemistry and psychology (1978 p47-48). "The manner of regarding the "signs" or phenomena of the world is closer to the approach of modern science than to that of mysticism .... i.e. tawhid-i-wujud.... Tawhid is to be interpreted as a unity of God with the world and with Man. Tawhid depicts a total harmonious living and self aware system (which) bestows upon Man independence and dignity" (1984 p52-53, p56). It is obvious that this understanding of tauhid is entirely alien to orthodox Islamic ontology and cosmology as developed by the Sunni and Shia ulema and muhadthiseen. It is a complete denial of man's abdiyat and of Allah's sovereignty.

Shariati follows Pascal in his interpretation of human nature (1984 p57) and Hegel in describing man "as dialectic reality" (1984 p57). Man enjoys freedom because "he is aware of all the secrets of nature" (p58)

Shariati's convoluted description of the struggle between good and evil is littered with Hegeian terminology – thesis, anti thesis, synthesis, opposites etc. He rejects the notion of "fixed standards of morality" for "Man is a choice, a struggle, a constant becoming .... religion is a path, a means not an aim or an end. All the misfortunes that have appeared in religious society anse from the fact that religion has become an end" (1984 p65). Prayer also is a means not an end (p65). That is why "non Muslims are better situated in today's world than Muslims ..... Worshippers of cows have outpaced worshippers of God and our pious believers are not even aware of this" (1984 p66). These quasi Heideggerian, quais Sartrean formulations graphically illustrate the unbridgeable gap between Shariati's thought and orthodox Islam.

The greatest influence on Shariati is that of Marx Shariati accepts historical materialism as a scientific fact. Shartiati finds room for this in his absurd reconstruction of the story of Cain and Abel "History like man consists of a dialectical process" (1984 p69). The struggle between Cain and Abel is a history of the clash of two modes of production, pastoral and agrarian, the later characterized by private property. Private property alone produced "a new man, an evil and powerful man" (1984 p71). Private property has been created exclusively by force. Private property destroyed the unity of the tribe and nurtured greed and acquisitiveness. It transformed society into warring camps – the possessors who "needed the labour of others" (1984 p73) and the dispossessed deprived of all access to means of production and subsistence.

Because of the carrion of private property the ties of kinship were replaced by the bonds of servitude" (1984 p76).

The only thing which separates Cain from Abel is the difference in the mode of production. (1984 p76-79). The mode of production is the infrastructure of society according to both Shariati and Marx. The orthodox understanding of the Quranic verses relating the Cain – Abel conflict are "superficial and over simplified. The story concerns the end of primitive communism the disappearance of man's original system of equality and brotherhood .... It confirms the scientific fact that life, society and history are based on contradiction and struggle and that contrary to the belief of the idealists the fundamental factors in all three are economics and sexuality which dominate religious faith" (1984 p80-81). At this point Shariati cites Marcuse in support of his argument.

According to Shariati abolishing private property will usher in the ideal society "In a society where all possess in common the bounties of life all will necessarily be equal and brothers and the spirit of kindness and solidarity and goodness will be cultivated" (1984 p83) "what makes Cain evil is an anti human social system a class society, a system of private ownership" (1984 p85).

Class struggle is the motor of history according to both Shariati and Marx. It is “the permanent war of history... the banner of Cain has always been held high by the ruling classes and the desire to avenge the blood of Abel has been inherited by succeeding generations of subjected people ... the weapon of Cain has been religion and the weapon of Abel has also been religion” (Shariati 1984 p85).

“We believe in the freedom of the individual” writes Shariati. “History advances on the bases of a universal and scientifically demonstrable process ... “I” as an individual must choose whether to move forward with history and accelerate its determined course .... Or to stand with ignorance, egoism, opportunism in the face of history” (1984 p87). Could any orthodox Marxist object to this formulation of the essence of historical materialism?

In Shariati’s view there can exist only two social structures, one characterized by common ownership and the other by private property (1984 p86). The system of private property is defended by the rulers (Pharaoh) the rich (Qaran) ‘and the long bearded’ priests. The three classes are constantly engaged in dominating, exploiting and deceiving the people” (1984 p90).

Shariati equates God and the people – Allah and al Nass, “whenever in the Quran social matters are mentioned Allah and Al-nass are virtually synonymous, interchangeable and yield the same meaning. The word Al nass and Allah belong together. When it is said that “Rule belongs to God” the meaning is that rule belongs to the people, not to those who present themselves as representative of God. When it is said that “property belongs to God” it means that capital belongs to that people as a whole. When it is said “Religion belongs to God the meaning is that the entire structure and content of religion belongs to the people” (1984 p94-96). The whole people can make of religion what they will for Shariati clearly rejects the idea of fixed standards. Religion in Shariati’s conception is merely an expression of Rousseau’s “general will”.

The people must abolish private property and re-establish communism (the system of Abel). The ideal man who will accomplish this task is “one who understands the beauty of science and the beauty of God. He listens to the words of Pascal and Descartes” (1984 p97). He is like Buddha, Lao Tze, Confucius, Spartacus, Jesus and Moses (p97). He “endures hardship for the sake of liberty and well being.. He is free of the compulsion of nature and history, the compulsion of society. Guided by science and technology he has freed himself from these prisons (i.e. nature, history and society). His character is liberated from the norms and conventions of his society” (1984 p98). For all intents and purposes this liberated, scientific modern man is God for Shariati can write:

**“The path that leads to God is the path that leads to Him by becoming Him” (1984 p98).**

Sharieati was a sincere and committed Islamic revolutionary. He sacrificed his life for Islam. Yet Islam survives in his thought merely as polemic and terminology. He has nothing but contempt for the glorious intellectual traditions of Islamic Iran and of Shiaism. His call for a “return to the Quran” is in practise a complete rejection of the traditions and the history of Islam. It is the history of modern Europe which he regards as authentic. He authenticates European cosmology, ontology and epistemology. His presuppositions, concepts, modes of analysis, policy prescriptions and ideals – all are derived from Enlightenment thought. They have literally nothing to do with Islam. His interpretation of Quranic teachings and of the character of Syedna Ali, and Imam Hussain are entirely alien to orthodox Islam – both Shia and Sunni – that is why he cannot cite the Ulema in support of his bizzare misinterpretations. His application of sociological methodologies for the analysis of Islamic concepts distorts these concepts beyond recognition. His acceptance of the presuppositions and value neutrality claims of socio logical methodologies signals his acceptance of the need for an absorbtion of Islamic civilization into the Western way of life – i.e. into capitalism.

Shariati misunderstands capitalism. Capitalism’s ontological presuppositions are Kantian / Humean. It seeks transcendence in this world through freedom, Shariati’s conception of tauheed ultimately denies the possibility of the finitude of this world by postulating the “unity” of this world and the hereafter and the similarity of the nature of man and God. Shariati denies man’s servitude and thus necessarily endorses freedom / capital Shariati’s is a this worldly spirituality which sees religion as merely a means for the achievement of freedom.

Shariati fails to understand that accumulation of capital requires the abolishing of private property. Liberalism accomplish this through the financial markets and socialism through the dictatorship of the proletariat. Citizens of communist states are as free and equal as stakeholders (shareholders and bank depositors) in a market economy. Both these forms of capitalist organization prioritize freedom / accumulation of capital, Shariati’s revolution is merely the substitution of one form of capitalist organization (despotism of the market) by another (democratic proletarian dictatorship). By promoting freedom in both these forms capitalism necessarily seeks the destruction of Islamic individuality and order, an individuality and on order explicitly rejecting freedom / capital and celebrating, servitude (abdiyat) to Allah under the authority and guidance (hidayat) of the ulema, the guardians of Islamic tradition (Sunnah) and consensus (ijma).

It is no wonder that Shariati’s most devoted followers – the Mujahideen-I-Khaliq – have always been the bitterest opponents of the ulema and the Islamic state. They – and the communist parties of Iran, Iraq,

Syria, Sudan and the Central Asian Republics – are enthusiastic agents of American imperialism, for America is their natural ally. America and the communists stand together for the universalization of freedom and for the destruction of Islamic individuality and Islamic order (abdiyat and hidayat).

It is acceptance of the value neutrality claims of sociological, methodology and theory which led a sincere Islamic revolutionary to commit such serious errors of analysis. We must reject the presuppositions, methodologies and policies of the social sciences and attempt to address contemporary issues on the basis of orthodox Islamic traditions authenticated by ijma and silsilah.

We pray to Allah to forgive and overlook Allama Shariati's errors and mistakes. These errors were made with all sincerity by a scholar from a pious and noble family. Allama Shariati sacrificed his life for Islam. He had great love for the Prophet (Sallal Allah-o-alahai wa salam) his companions and the holy Ahl-i-Bait. He sought to promote unity between Shias and Sunnis. May Allah reward him and assign to him a high station in heaven.

#### **Summary: Islamic Sociology and Capitalism**

- × Shariati applied the sociological theories and methods of Marx, Fanon and the writers of the French analytical school to Islamic themes.
- × He saw Islam as "a median school intermediate between capitalism and socialism. Shariati presents a third wordlist quasi. Marxist interpretation of Islamic social practise.
- × Shariati rejects Islamic history, consensus (ijma) and theology as a source of Islamic social theory. He recommends an abandonment of all Islamic knowledge accumulated over the centuries. He argues that the Quran should be reinterpreted to enhance the scope of the new human and social sciences. The Quran according to Shariati fully endorses sociological methodologies.
- × Reflecting on the Quran leads Shariati to the view that the active force in history is the mass (Al-Nass) and to the acceptance of the quasi. Spenserian / Lamarkian view that society is like a living organism answerable for its deeds and with definite immutable laws of change. Shariati endorses the Kantian conception of human freedom (autonomous understanding of mature and its laws). Enlightenment epistemology is accepted by Shariati and its ontological presupposition as true. Mechanistic / empiricist methods are accepted as value neutral.
- × In Shariati's view the scientific method is inspired by Islam and we should hasten to follow in the footsteps of the Enlightenment in applying the sociological method to the study of religion. He applauds Abduhu's Islamic modernism.



- × According to Shariati the application of the sociological methods shows that the Prophet (SAW) initiated a class war against the aristocrats and merchant. He was engaged in a war of liberation. This role of the Prophet (SAW) and Imam Hussain has not been understood by the Ulema and the Islamic tradition. It has become comprehensible only with the development of the social sciences which show us that “Islam is the true humanism”.
- × Shariati believes that “man is God’s relative who can act like God. The “names” taught by Allah to Adam are the “truths of science”. Science confirms the unity of God, man and the universe (tawhid-i-wajud). According to Shariati the truths regarding this unity are revealed by phenomenology, physics and chemistry, not by mysticism. This conception of tauhid is a complete denial of abdiyat and a rejection of classical Islamic ontology and cosmology. Shariati’s conception of human nature and of man’s position in the universe is derived from Pascal, Spencer and Hegel. His conception of the struggle between good and evil is a reinterpretation of Hegelian dialectics. He rejects the existence of fixed unchanging norms and standards of morality. Religion and prayers are seen merely as means for the achievement of human freedom. “Worshippers of cows” have understood this better than the “worshippers of God” according to Shariah.
- × Shariati accepts historical materialism as a scientific fact. He accepts the Marxist claim that changes in the mode of production are the fundamental determinants of change in morality and social organization. The existence of private property is the source of all evil according to Shariati. Class struggle between the possessed and the dispossessed is the motor of history and “economics and sexuality dominate religious faith”.
- × Shariati does not recognize that capitalism abolishes private property through the financial markets. He believes that abolishing private property will lead to the creation of the ideal individual and ideal society. “Long bearded” priests are accused of deceiving the people by legitimating private property.
- × Shariati equates God and the people. Allah and Al-Nass carry the same meaning in the Quranic verses referring to social affairs according to Shariati. “When it is said that rule belongs to God the meaning is that rule belongs to the people writes Shariati, “as does capital and religion”. Religion is merely a “path to freedom” a manifestation of Rousseau’s general will according to Shariati. The people must free themselves by abolishing private property. They are free of and master of nature, history and society. Guided by science and technology the people seek progress and abundance.
- × Shariati was a committed Islamic revolutionary. He joined the ranks of the holy martyrs of the Islamic revolution in Iran. Yet Islam survives in his analysis merely as rhetoric and symbol. He totally rejects Islamic ontology, historical tradition and orthodox social practise. He accepts European history as authentic and universal. He authenticates Enlightenment ontology, epistemology and social discourse. His application of sociological methodologies to Islamic concepts distorts them beyond recognition. He is an uncritical disciple of Spenser and Pascal and

Marx. His acceptance of the value neutralist claims of the sociological methodologies signal his endorsement of the project to subsume Islam within the capitalist way of life.

- × Shariati rejects man's servitude to God and by accepting freedom as an end in itself, he is accepting accumulation. Accumulation requires the abolition of private property whether through the financial markets or through the dictatorship of the proletariat. Like the Marxists all Shariati seeks is a restructuring of capitalist order for the achievement of greater freedom, equality and abundance.
- × The promotion of freedom / accumulation necessarily destroys Islamic individuality. It destroys the legitimacy of the leadership of the ulema and challenges the authenticity of Islamic history and tradition. It devalues the virtues of abdiyat and hidayat and creates a this worldly spiritually proclaiming the eternity of the world and man's participation in God's sovereignty.
- × It is natural that Shariati's closest followers the Mujahideen-i-Khalq have always been the bitterest enemies of the ulema and of the Islamic state. They and the communists are American imperialism's closest allies in the struggle to destroy Islamic individuality and create secular order in the Muslim world.
- × It was the uncritical acceptance of the value neutrality claims of sociological theories which lead such a sincere Islamic revolutionary as Ali Shariati to make such serious errors. The Islamic response to contemporary challenges must be based on the classical Islamic branches of learning authenticated by silsilah and ijma.

## Chapter 5

### Overthrowing Capitalism; A Ghazalian Perspective

The foundations for such a rejection of the Western way of life was laid by Hazrat Shaikh al Mashaikh Imdadullah Muhajir Makki(may Allah bless him) the Amir of the 1857 jihad. Hazrat Qutub-ul Alam (may Allah bless him) insisted that the project for constructing an Islamic state was inextricably interlinked with the project of totally rejecting the Western way of life.

There are two essential elements in the Islamic revolutionary response to the West, First we must articulate a principled and practical rejection of capitalism as a way of life – its norms, regulation procedures and transaction forms. This involves the construction and consolidation of a religious society encompassing the cultural, economic and political life of the Muslims. Authority at all levels must be concentrated in the hands of the Ulema and the mosque and the madrassah must be developed as central institutional modes for organizing the Islamic systemic resistance to capitalism. In a country such as Pakistan there are ample opportunities for doing this. A very large proportion of businesses are outside the capitalist order – they do not transact with financial markets and their owners do not seek profit maximization. It is entirely possible to develop a mosque / madrassah based system of tamweel for establishing a counter capitalist economy and for mobilizing the power of the bazaar for the overthrow of capitalist order. This has been done in Iran and the Islamic movements of Indonesia and Malaysia have developed several institutional initiatives to achieve this end.

Similarly Islamic movements can utilize the power of the trade unions for delegitimizing capitalist property. Unions under the leadership of the ulema should abandon the struggle for workers rights and higher wages within the capitalist system. They must seek the transcendence of capitalist order through an abolition of capitalist money and finance and the utilization of state resources for deconstructing capitalist property and delinking from globalized capitalist markets.

The Islamic movements aim at creating a universal state. We explicitly reject the possibility of carving and a niche for a Muslim state within capitalist order through struggles for national liberalization. We seek not liberation but humanity's total submission to the will of God. An Islamic state is necessarily a Jihadi state. The democratic process may be a mean for the construction of such a state. But the Islamic state is committed to the total destruction of democracy and republicanism in all forms. This is because we reject the possibility of validating norms and practices with reference to 'general will' or 'the will of all'. We regard the quest for autonomy as a quest for evil. Islam is the submission of the will of man to the will of God – all truth claims are validated with reference to God's will, and to it alone. Islam is a reassertion of the pre Augustinian commitment.

"Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven".

Such a comprehensive social and political struggle against capitalist order has to be firmly rooted in Islamic epistemology.

The fifteenth century of the Islamic era is one of accelerated disintegration of the capitalist way of life throughout the world. Western savagery can no longer sustain the pretense that it is a civilization. Today the Enlightenment project has all but collapsed. As Wendy Brown argues “the West is still grieving the loss of belief in progress, rights, freedom, reason. Yet it still holds these ideals to be irreplaceable” (2001 p 103). Foucault and Gadamar and Gray and Rorty and Taylor have shown that it is quite impossible to theoretically justify capitalist norms and practices. The Islamic assault on capitalism and on Western savagery is gaining momentum because of the inherent incoherences of modernist and post modernist discourses.

Reinterpreting Enlightenment epistemology and the projects built upon this epistemology makes no sense in these circumstances. As the previous chapter has shown Islamising social sciences produces only apologies for capitalist practices and liberal policies. This subordinates Islamic scholarship and the political strategy of Islamic movements to human rights imperialism at a time when the imperialist system is beginning to implode.

Moreover legitimating capitalist norms and institutions makes the construction and sustenance of Islamic individuality, society and state more and more difficult. Legitimation of capitalist norms and practices by Christianity led to the development of an individuality incapable of surrender to God’s will and dominated by the passions of avarice and jealousy. Marketisation of society has led to a shocking decline of sexual morality and a disintegration of family and community. Finally the liberal state has imposed capitalist oppression throughout the world slaughtering hundreds of millions of people in America, Australia, sub Saharan Africa, Vietnam, Iraq, Afghanistan, Palestine and Latin America for the subordination of these countries to global capital. Rejecting Enlightenment epistemology is necessary to avoid and to overcome moral decadence and physical destruction throughout the world.

Rejecting social science in particular must involve a recognition of the contingent character of capitalist individuality and rationality. It is not necessary that avarice and covetousness dominate human consciousness. Similarly the dedication of thought and practice to the pursuit of freedom and the maximization of power/pleasure is neither inevitable nor desirable.

Imam Ghazali (may Allah shower HIS choicest blessings on our master) provides a framework for demonstrating the incoherence of all unIslamic metaphysical and epistemological discourses. Unlike the Mutazila our Imam did not try to incorporate alien discourses into the Islamic system of knowledge. He developed a critique of Greek thought on the basis of Islamic principles – and demonstrated its incoherence in order to refute it and overcome and destroy it. This ensured that Islam was not submerged within an alien system of thought and practices but sought and achieved its total destruction in the Muslim world. The Ghazalian approach explicitly refutes the claim that the West is a superior or

universal epistemological and moral civilization. It rejects the possibility of a dialogue with the West<sup>cv</sup>. The Ghazalian approach does not see any of the streams of Western thought and practice as a continuation of Islam. The Ghazalian approach seeks the destruction of modernity and post modernity and of Western hegemony. It tries to pave the way for the deconstruction of all Western knowledge and practise by highlighting its incoherences. This can be done both by developing an internalist and an externalist critique of Western knowledge and practice (Rizvi 2002, 2003).

The internalist critique of Western philosophy and of the social sciences is an attempt at demonstrating the incoherences of the presumptions underlying this analysis, their methodological incoherences their concealed meanings and implications and their lack of correspondence to reality. This has in a rudimentary and very preliminary manner been attempted in of this book<sup>cvii</sup>. Such an internal critique can be developed by Islamic revolutionary workers familiar with Western thought.

Such internalist critique must be accompanied by the development of an externalist Ghazalian critique of Western philosophy and the social sciences. Presumptions, methodologies and practices and policies produced by social sciences must be critiqued from an Islamic epistemological perspective. This externalist Ghazalian critique can be developed only by the orthodox<sup>cviii</sup> Ulema and Soofia. It cannot be undertaken by Muslims who have not been methodically educated in the classical Islamic branches of knowledge.

Following in the footsteps of our master Imam Ghazali we will insha Allah develop this internalist and externalist critique to show the inherent incoherence of Western thought and practise and to destroy the intellectual and political hegemony of the West. This is essential for the triumph of Islam as the only universal civilization through transcending capitalism.

The incorporation of social sciences methodologies and associated rationalities and practices within the classical Islamic branches of learning is impossible because of a fundamental dichotomy in the presumptions underlying Islamic and Enlightenment epistemologies<sup>cix</sup>. Islamic learning is grounded in belief in tauheed manifested in a recognition of the metaphysical and axiological ultimacy of Allah (subhanahu wa ta'ala). This is the perception and assertion of the following truths.

- There exists a transcendent Creator and historical creatures separated by an unbridgeable ontological gap.
- The Creator's will constitutes the creatures' "ought to be" expressed in terms of both Shariati and Tariqa (s) as articulated in the continuing history of the ummah authenticated by silsilah and ijma.
- Human beings are necessarily required to submit to the will of the Creator. Human beings are capable of moral actions but actions are moral only to the extent to which they articulate man's surrender to God's will.

- The 'normativeness of the oughts' and the moral capability of human beings entail the necessity of judgment of intentions and action in the hereafter. Attainment of God's pleasure and of rewards in the hereafter are the objectives of all human thought and action.
- Knowledge is essentially awareness of God's will with respect to human being and human conduct.

Enlightenment epistemology is an outright rejection of these primary truths<sup>cx</sup>. Similarly there is no room for freedom, equality, self determination, human rights, tolerance, welfare and progress in Islamic epistemology and our classical branches of learning. Apologetic attempts at providing space for these concepts within Islamic epistemology are elements of the imperialist strategy to subordinate Islam to Western savagery. We reject Western philosophy and the social sciences because

- methodologies underlying them are not value neutral. Their purpose is to justify and provide technologies of governance for capitalist order
- their conception of being and of the world sees man as creator, sustainer and sovereign
- Enlightenment philosophy and social science holds that man imposes order upon on the natural world through a process of self reflection. This makes empirical enquiry possible and the purpose of both self reflection and experimental enquiry is the actualization of human freedom and autonomy. The commands of the self cannot be evaluated except formally (on the basis of universalisability). Reason here is a means for obeying the universalisable commands of the unknowable self
- The self judges and cannot itself be the subject of judgment. There is no room in Western philosophy and the social sciences for the recognition of God as sovereign law giver.
- the social sciences are the practical methodologies articulating the philosophy of mechanism and utilitarianism.
- the social sciences are committed to the flourishing and the satisfaction of the passions and not to the elimination of vice.
- the social sciences legitimate and facilitate the functioning of capitalist order which seeks the universalisation of the passion to make money.

The purpose of social enquiry in Islam is the formation and sustenance of an individuality and of a society which voluntarily submits to God's will. Such an individuality and society recognizes freedom as evil. Freedom is essentially al Bagh, (rebellion). Freedom is the choice of choice itself – the assertion of man's (fictitious) authority and capability to subject the world to his arbitrarily willed (universalisable) preferences. The theoretical preference for preference is in practise the preference for capital – for in secular orders capital alone is universalisable and in principle limitless. That is why the social sciences legitimate and provide technologies for the creation and sustenance of capitalist individuality civil, society and capitalist states.

Attempts at practicing social science methodology within the constraints of the Shariah – as reflected in the writings of Maulana Maududi on Islamic government – legitimate capitalist practices at both the individual and the institutional level<sup>cx<sup>i</sup></sup>. They do not contest capitalist rationality but instead accommodate Islam within capitalist order. Nineteenth century clergymen and modern Christian apologists within the Christian Democratic parties of Europe have presented similar arguments for reconciling capitalist practices with the ‘spirit of Christianity’ Euben (1999) argues that modern Christian and Islamic fundamentalism may be seen as attempts at “re-enchanting” the Enlightenment rather than as anti Enlightenment movements because they limit and do not in principle reject Enlightenment rationality and the associated goals of freedom and progress<sup>cx<sup>ii</sup></sup>. The practise of Shariah constrained ideologies and technologies in Iran and Saudi Arabia illustrates how this opens up these societies to capitalist penetration. Religious individualities and Shariah constraints on market and state institutions become delegitimised and political authority is transferred from the ulema to the agents and representatives of national and global capital.

Social science is a product of Enlightenment philosophy and a technology for the legitimation and practise of capitalist governmentality. Islam is committed to the overthrow of capitalism as a way of life and rejecting social science rationalities is therefore necessary Islamic social enquiry must focus attention on creating rationalities and methodologies which can foster the growth of Islamic individuality and the flourishing of the Islamic virtues within the context of the contemporary challenge with which the Islamic revolutionary movements<sup>cx<sup>iii</sup></sup> are confronted.

Islamic social enquiry seeks the transcendence of capitalist order through the universalisation of the practise of Islamic virtues in the life of the individual, the society and the state. The flourishing of these virtues and the contractual and institutional structures which sustain them has been the concern of the classical Islamic branches of learning. These branches of learning provide an appropriate paradigm for addressing contemporary issues with reference to the sustenance of Islamic individuality and society. Our social theorizing must be contextualized by and located within the traditional Islamic episteme. The ulema and soofia have zealously preserved the epistemological heritage of Islam. In the subcontinent the ulema of Barrailly and Dewband have in extremely difficult circumstances comprehensively defeated the modernists and revisionists who sought to corrupt traditional Islamic learning by its incorporation within Western epistemes<sup>cx<sup>iv</sup></sup>. This magnificent achievement of the ulema and soofia makes it possible to continue Hazrat Qutab-al-Alam Imadullah Muhajir Makki’s project of integrating the quest for spiritual revival and the revitalization of Islamic learning with the organization of a movement of jihad against the West<sup>cx<sup>v</sup></sup>. The development of an Islamic critique of the presuppositions and methodologies of the social sciences (the development that is of an externalist Ghazalian critique of Western philosophy and the social sciences) is an indispensable step in the deconstruction of Enlightenment and post Enlightenment epistemes and in conceptualizing contemporary issues on the basis of the assumptions and methodologies rooted in Islamic epistemology and in our classical branches of learning.

The development of an externalist Ghazalian critique of Enlightenment philosophy of the social sciences provides a basis for the expansion of the scope of the classical Islamic branches of learning. In particular the scope of Fiqh, Ilm-i-Kalam and Usul-u-deen need to be broadened to enable us to analyze contemporary problems and issues on the basis of Islamic ontological assumptions and within the

context of Islamic epistemological methodologies. This broadening of scope must entail a construction on the basis of our inherited wisdom and an elaboration of the teachings on which there is general consensus. Theories articulated within this context must confirm to the maqasid-e-Sharia and be derived on the basis of methods and mechanisms sanctioned by the *usul-I-fiqh* for theorizing and for articulation of policy based on legitimately constructed theories. The *ijtihad* this entails is *taqleedi-ijtihad* – an *ijtihad* which confirms, elaborates and vindicates the *ijmah* of the Ummah<sup>cxvi</sup>. Such *ijtihad* provides grounds for asserting Islam's claims as universal history and as the world's only civilization (Qutb 1974 p51-60). It provides an indispensable epistemological basis for transcending Western philosophy and social sciences and waging permanent *jihad* against Western savagery<sup>cxvii</sup>.

Our commitment to undertake permanent *jihad* against Western savagery reflects our principled rejection of the rule of capital. The West has rejected Christianity and embraced capitalism as a *deen*. It has rearticulated. Pharaoh's age old claim – *ana rub kum al ala*. (I am your great Lord). The rule of capital rejects the sovereignty of God and proclaims the false doctrine of freedom (human autonomy and self determination). The theoretical preference for preference is in practise the universal dominance of the vices of avarice and covetousness. Western man is possessed by the devils of covetousness and lust. He has filled the world with sexual vice – pornography, nudity, fornication, homosexuality, lesbianism, AIDS. He has corrupted economic life by infusing *riba* and *gharrar* in all production and exchange transactions. He continues to slaughter hundreds of million of innocent victims – Red Indian, Vietnamese, Cambodians, Palestinian, Kashmiri, Iraqis and Afghans – in a never to be satisfied blood lust for freedom and plentitude. Western philosophy and social science justifies man's rebellion against God, the explosion of sexual vice, institutionalized economic exploitation and human rights imperialism.

A carefully crafted revolutionary strategy to build an anti-imperialist, anti capitalist universal state in the Muslim world has reasonable chances of success in these circumstances. Our chances of achieving the overthrow of capitalist order are improved in countries such as Pakistan due to the incoherence of modernist discourse as articulated by the local supporters of American imperialism (see Appendix 1). Perhaps we are in the *Narodnik* stage of our revolution or in its 1883 (when Plekhanov set up the party) or in its 1902 (when 'What Is To Be Done' appeared) or in its 1905. But its 1917 seems a distinct possibility because of liberalism's inherent incoherences and vulnerability, its inability to justify the rule of capital, the moral degeneration that is its inevitable consequence and the continuing weakening of the client states.

The socialist revolution was defeated because socialism did not reject enlightenment ontology – the worship of man remained as central to socialism as to liberalism and capital cannot be transcended without rejecting man worship. The Islamic revolution is essentially a revival of the pre Augustinian commitment. "Thy Kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven". Islam represents an internal – not an external – threat to capitalism. It is capitalism's definitive critique and not simply another attempt to re-enchant the capitalist world as the Jewish political theorist Roxana Euben fantasizes (1999). Today Islam threatens Washington as Christianity threatened Rome in the 4<sup>th</sup> century.



The priority concern at present must be to mobilize the masses to resist American hegemony and to raise the costs of American occupation of Iraq and Afghanistan and American support of the Zionist enemy. This must be accompanied by the struggle to de-legitimate capitalist and liberal norms and institutions and to struggle for the establishment of a non-national Khalifat. The coming together of all Islamic forces on the basis of Islam's orthodox doctrines and practices with the masque as the organizational focus and in resolute opposition to the rule of law of capital is possible and should be our goal.

## Notes

---

- <sup>i</sup> Capitalism and democracy may take the form of socialist and totalitarian orders by the contracting individuals ceding their autonomy to the general will creating an (autonomous) Leviathan state.
- <sup>ii</sup> We shall be concerned with the individual self as the object of our enquiry in contemporary (non totalitarian) democracy and (non socialist) capitalism.
- <sup>iii</sup> The self is not transcendent in the sense of being beyond or outside of experiencing or conceptualizing the world.
- <sup>iv</sup> This is precisely what Hume denies.
- <sup>v</sup> It is in this sense that Kant describes belief in God as another “postulate of pure practical reason”. It is difficult to separate this from that other “postulate of pure practical reason” the belief in freedom for Kant often argues that God’s divine plan is actually unfolding in contemporary history. It is but a short step from here to Hegel’s deification of history.
- <sup>vi</sup> I seek Allah’s pardon and His refuge for the blasphemies expressed in this paragraph.
- <sup>vii</sup> Dialectics derives from the Greek word for conversation
- <sup>viii</sup> Not negative freedom for the individual but positive freedom for the language community.
- <sup>ix</sup> The Eurocentricism of Hegel’s fundamental concepts has often been commented upon. He famously derided oriental thought for “its arbitrariness, savagery and dimness of passions”. He was also deeply contemptuous of Catholicism.
- <sup>x</sup> Schopenhauer takes the concept of the Will from Augustine’s conception of God who Augustine sees as having manifestations in time and space but possessing a transcendent existence.
- <sup>xi</sup> More than a hundred years before Freud Schopenhauer spoke of unconscious motives.
- <sup>xii</sup> In Schopenhauer’s world the will dominates us through sex and the end of love is only disillusionment and suffering.
- <sup>xiii</sup> Kierkegaard writes often of the paradoxes of Christian dogma and the inherent absurdity of a Christian commitment.
- <sup>xiv</sup> In the sense in which Hegel conceives of moral progress through history.
- <sup>xv</sup> And absurdly even Shariati and Khatami (See Sec. 4.4 below)
- <sup>xvi</sup> All objects need not exist as all ideas need not be true
- <sup>xvii</sup> Heidegger also was to have a shot at this later.
- <sup>xviii</sup> One of the most important influences on Iqbal.
- <sup>xix</sup> Bergson recognizes that such acts may be exceptional but says that this does not mean that human acts are predetermined.
- <sup>xx</sup> The other great Western influence on Iqbal.
- <sup>xxi</sup> The main difference between Kant and Husserl is that in Husserl’s thought the transcendental Ego and the essential categories of consciousness are not logical deductions (as in Kant) but directly intuited (discovered).
- <sup>xxii</sup> Freud’s libido is only a slightly personalized version of Schopenhauer’s “will”.
- <sup>xxiii</sup> I.e. the tendency of an organism to stabilize itself and divest itself of energy altogether - Freud also called this ‘the Nirvana principle’.
- <sup>xxiv</sup> Except in the form of tautologies and mathematical equations. “Outside of logic everything is accidental” (1922 6.3).

---

<sup>xxxv</sup> Unlike the Kantian transcendental ego

<sup>xxxvi</sup> Heidegger calls this concernedness “ontological” and says this is what distinguishes Riffat from other beings in the world.

<sup>xxxvii</sup> Except that the choice to choose freedom itself is necessary

<sup>xxxviii</sup> This is Camus’ formulation.

<sup>xxxix</sup> It is this conception of all human relationships being inherently confliction which lies at the root of de Beaviour’s portrayal of gender relationships (1964). Much feminist thought revolves around this theme.

<sup>xxx</sup> Structuralists do of course downgrade the importance of meaning. This is a necessary consequence of the disappearance of the subject. If there is no subject there can be no meaning - it is as if the universal mind can only dictate relations and identify the elements of a system.

<sup>xxxi</sup> Structuralism is concerned with identifying all possible permutations of the elements of a system and this is not Foucault’s concern.

<sup>xxxii</sup> Of God and the world and the self as an inner certainty.

<sup>xxxiii</sup> I.e. of agreement of the meaning of inherently meaningless discourse.

<sup>xxxiv</sup> I.e. the transformation of personal into capitalist property and the replacement of the natural by the legal (the company) person as the main free and equal contractor in the market (Hegel 1952 paras 158 - 169).

<sup>xxxv</sup> Although this can be read as a warning against the marketization of family / friendship relations.

<sup>xxxvi</sup> As Sogoff (1983) argues social cost benefit analysis presumes the dominance of market valuation processes when seeking to assign costs and benefits to practices, which are outside the market domain (due to ‘market failure’). Assignment of value to these practises thus reflects preferences of moneyed individuals and not political judgments. (See also Keat 1994).

<sup>xxxvii</sup> Weber called it the “Protestant ethic”

<sup>xxxviii</sup> Thus Taqi Usmani (1997) has recently sought to provide Islamic legitimation for corporate personhood (Sec. 4.2 below).

<sup>xxxix</sup> Written into the US constitution by the Fifth Amendment

<sup>xl</sup> Socialism accepts the doctrine of the eternity of the world and endorses the priority of the quest for freedom. It argues however that market dominance restricts freedom and market generated distributional inequalities are transcendable.

<sup>xli</sup> We speak of Pakistan in the third section.

<sup>xlii</sup> As argued above a private life is impossible in mature capitalism but there is the need to convince Riffat to prioritise the desire of freedom over all other desires in her private evaluations. Capitalism seeks to persuade her to make this immoral choice personally.

<sup>xliii</sup> Especially for economics which is a study of equilibria and is methodologically incapable of taking time seriously.

<sup>xliv</sup> We speak of America in the fourth section.

<sup>xlv</sup> All figures are based on estimates presented in UN (1999)

<sup>xlvi</sup> The Islamic parties are instinctively anti-imperialist but lack of clarity about the nature of democratic practice and its relationship to global capitalist hegemony. This makes it difficult for them to adopt a coherent counter imperialist economic strategy.

<sup>xlvii</sup> It is often not realized that the Islamic Development Bank is tightly controlled and supervised by the World Bank. It provides no loans in the absence of IMF approval.

<sup>xlviii</sup> A detailed Islamic analysis of globalization and localization is presented in a special issue of Sahil June 2000, 278/17 Federal B Area Karachi.

---

<sup>xlix</sup> Subject only to the limitation that she cannot will that which is not universalisable - her commitment to equal freedom and to the recognition of the human other as an end in himself.

<sup>l</sup> Figures in this paragraph are taken from Peterson (1999) pp. 42-49.

<sup>li</sup> As Saudi Arabia funded America's invasion of the Gulf in 1991 and Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia and the UAE continue to finance American occupation of the Gulf region today.

<sup>lii</sup> Newton is said to have been pleased to note that the law of gravity did not adequately sustain the view that the universe was a self regulated system. There was thus a gap in his theory which could be filled by recognizing divine intervention. This pleased Newton for he was a devout Protestant, author of several apologetic, religious tracts (Roberts 1997 p660).

<sup>liii</sup> The self is not transcendent in the sense of being outside the world (i.e. beyond experiencing or conceptualizing it).

<sup>liv</sup> This is precisely what Hume denies

<sup>lv</sup> This "world wide plentitude" would ensure that world politics need not be conducted as a zero sum game and many Scottish Enlightenment thinkers (including Smith) believed that an expansion of capitalism would lead to an eventual elimination of war (Hunt and Iganteiff 1983).

<sup>lvi</sup> For a brief Islamic evaluation of capitalist order see Ansari (2002 p5-44). For a detailed unIslamic evaluation see Meszoros (1995).

<sup>lvii</sup> Capital may be defined as takkathur which is rendered into English by Maulana Muhammad Marmaduke Pickthall as "rivalry in worldly increase". This definition captures the twin features of capital – covetousness ("rivalry") and avarice ("worldly increase"). Capital is a vice – the never ending quest for more through continued intensification of rivalries.

<sup>lviii</sup> Recktenwald (1973) makes a similar claim for Francis Quesnay (1694-1774) who according to Recktenwald "by 1758 had formulated the principals of the new science" (1973 p7). The Tableau Economique was printed that year. The early editions of the Tableau however contain only about 20-2 pages Quesnay started teaching economics in 1767.

<sup>lix</sup> I.e. the transformation of "religious" society into "civil" society

<sup>lx</sup> We will return to this point below

<sup>lxi</sup> Of labourers and the landed gentry in the case of Smith and labourers and capitalists in the case of Ricardo

<sup>lxii</sup> As Locke shows labour power is capitalist property and must be regarded as such for the rational man must dedicate his body to capital accumulation. See below.

<sup>lxiii</sup> Note that this is not the substance but only the form of capital. The substance of capital is avarice and covetousness. Capital is takkathur.

<sup>lxiv</sup> Actually existing socialism (Russia, China and East Europe) shows that the practice of freedom at the collective level (based on class or national interest maximization) does not eliminate avarice and covetousness at the individual level. Socialist systems therefore collapse and increasing space has to be found for the practice of freedom through the construction of markets, specially financial markets. Socialism does not repudiate freedom as an ideal and the Hegel-Marx tradition is as legitimate an inheritor of Enlightenment thought as the Hume-Kant-Smith tradition.

<sup>lxv</sup> After all the Roman Empire, a licentious and materialistic order had been overthrown by a Christian movement espousing the ideals of love, charity and poverty.

<sup>lxvi</sup> The defeat of the Keynesians and the intellectual dominance of the New Classical school in the last quarter of the 20<sup>th</sup> century is a reassertion of the continued supremacy of the marginalist school within economics.

<sup>lxvii</sup> An introductory description of these is to be found in Ansari et al (2004) Chps. 1 and 2

<sup>lxviii</sup> On this sec. Hi (2000)

<sup>lxix</sup> An inspiration for the work of both Schumpeter and Hayek

---

<sup>lxx</sup> The claims that Machiavelli (1773) was its founding father reflects some similarities between his work and that of the Encyclopedists with reference to a rejection of Christian metaphysics and reliance on empiricism.

<sup>lxxi</sup> For a detailed discussion of the method of the Encyclopedists see Wade (1977).

<sup>lxxii</sup> In this respect it bears strong resemblance to neo classical economics.

<sup>lxxiii</sup> I.e. while a theory cannot be verified it can be falsified by one discernable event contrary to its prediction.

<sup>lxxiv</sup> As against the realm of necessity which is the sphere of production and exchange.

<sup>lxxv</sup> Also he separates truth from power

<sup>lxxvi</sup> There is of course pre Enlightenment political theory but no pre Enlightenment political science.

<sup>lxxvii</sup> Rawls endorses this conception of the self as we argue below: Rational choice theory and utilitarianism also endorse this conception of the self as a maximizer of utility derived from arbitrarily willed preferences. It is on this basis that Sandel (1982) points to the close affinity between Rawls and utilitarianism.

<sup>lxxviii</sup> Which itself is accepted as natural and inevitable

<sup>lxxix</sup> This position is analyzed in some detail in Rizvi (2003)

<sup>lxxx</sup> Foucault (1973) provides the basis for understanding the social sciences as 'world productive' epistemes.

<sup>lxxxi</sup> I.e. the realization of freedom through rational enquiry and the discovery of universalisable moral laws.

<sup>lxxxii</sup> Although he recognizes that which must be subordinated and silenced for the functioning of this truth.

<sup>lxxxiii</sup> In authors such as Hegel and Fukuyama this thought leads to the view that through liberal democracy we have already arrived at perfect freedom – we are at the end of history.

<sup>lxxxiv</sup> This necessary disavowal of otherness is required for drawing the boundaries of the self.

<sup>lxxxv</sup> Brought together in Derrida's concept of differentiation (1976)

<sup>lxxxvi</sup> Similar positions have been advanced by post modern anti racist and anti colonialist authors see. e.g. Bhabha (2001).

<sup>lxxxvii</sup> Charles Taylor (1997) and John Gray (1995) present broadly similar arguments for justifying what they refer to as "post liberalism".

<sup>lxxxviii</sup> The classical statement justifying this "marketisation of individuality" is of course Smith's Theory of Moral Sentiments

<sup>lxxxix</sup> This is an aspect of the universalization of capitalist property which (a) makes non waged subsistence impossible for the vast majority of the population and (b) makes non wage income (obtained through profit, interest and rent) dependent on the performance of workers and managers, both waged agents of capital.

<sup>xc</sup> Some authors such as Lash and Urry (1989) argue that the atomization of labour (through human resource management practices) is also a requirement for the universalization of capitalist property and the dominance of financial markets in capitalist order cannot be achieved without such atomization.

<sup>xci</sup> In underdeveloped capitalist orders such as Pakistan the experts may include secular religious professionals who show that facilitating capital accumulation is God's will.

<sup>xcii</sup> It is not clear that the need for formal governance decreases with the maturing of capitalist order. Social democracy – the institutionalization of national insurance and collective bargaining – may be seen as a way of increasing self governance. But increased conflict between trade union bureaucracies and shop floor activists seem to belie this hope. Human resources management practices also do not seem to expand the scope for self governance.

<sup>xciii</sup> Syed Qutb uses these concepts in Ma'alin fit Tarig and both Maulana Maududi and Syed Qutb described Western civilization as Jahiliyat-I-Khalisa Syed Qutb develops the argument that civilization is necessarily Islamic and Islamic civilization confronts not other civilizations but savagery (1973 p78-81). Maulana Muhammad Marmadukh Pickthall makes a similar point (1960 p184).

<sup>xciv</sup> This separates Maulana Maududi's thought not only from jadidis and innovators such as Amir Ali, Khalifa Abdul Hakim and Ghulam Ahmad Pervaiz but also from that of Islamic modernists such as Allama Iqbal, who argue that some Enlightenment schools of thought – in Iqbal's case, empiricism – are inspired by Islam and therefore provide a basis for inter-civilization dialogue.

<sup>xcv</sup> Maulana Maududi recognizes eminence (fazilat) on grounds of personal ability and character (1990 p140) but suggests no procedures and institutions for articulating this pre-eminence of the able and the pious in Islamic political order.

<sup>xcvi</sup> Universal franchise is unreservedly endorsed by Maulana Maududi. He writes "the electoral system must be so devised that the whole nation and every individual can participate in it" (1990 p370).

<sup>xcvii</sup> He also endorses due process of law (1990 p389).

<sup>xcviii</sup> Maulana Maududi recognizes that "legislation within the constraints of the Shariah" requires legislatures" who have the following characteristics.

- a) Belief in the Shariah, sincere wish to obey the commands of Allah and reject all other sources of legislation.
- b) Knowledge of Arabic grammar and literature.
- c) Comprehensive knowledge of the Quran and Sunnah and of Islam as a complete, closed system of beliefs and practices.
- d) Knowledge of the work of the established fuqaha and schools of fiqh and intention to "legislate" in a manner which ensures continuity of the legal tradition of Islam (1990 p445).

<sup>xcix</sup> As we have argued above Locke could not substantiate this view by reference to the Bible.

<sup>c</sup> This view also required the assumption that there was no authentic interpretation of the divine will. The Protestant revolt against Catholicism was premised on the argument that the Church had no right to insist on the authenticity of its interpretation of the Bible and every Christian had the right to independently interpret scripture. As a devout Protestant Locke was thus on sound grounds when he rejected the traditional interpretation of Biblical teachings.

<sup>ci</sup> Divine will can also be interpreted as having no content whatsoever.

<sup>cii</sup> This is not a problem for Locke for in his conception divine will is empty and its substantive content is necessarily provided by the general will.

<sup>ciii</sup> It also implies that classical Muslim political philosophy misconceived political order.

<sup>civ</sup> Rawls (1985) recognizes this and believes that such movements can be part of his overlapping consensus.

<sup>cv</sup> Thus Euben (1999) argues that Islamic fundamentalist movements seek a 're-enchantment' of liberal order and therefore the work of Syed Qutb and Maulana Maududi should be viewed in the same perspective as the works of mainstream communitarians (MacIntyre, Taylor, Rorty etc.)

<sup>cvi</sup> This is not a rejection of the possibility of Islamic dawah to individual Europeans or Americans. As Islamic da'ee we invite them to reject the ontological and epistemological presumptions and participate in the task of destroying Western savagery. We reject the possibility of dialogue in the sense that we do not recognize the West as a civilization and reject the possibility of peaceful coexistence with it.

<sup>cvi</sup> For an excellent example of such an internalist Ghazalian critique of modernist and post modernist liberal thought see Rizvi (2003, 2004).

<sup>cvi</sup> i.e. rasikh-ul-aqeeda

<sup>cix</sup> The incorporation of Islamic themes within the social science paradigm is also impossible for the same reason.

---

<sup>cx</sup> The 'Islamisation of social sciences' project glosses over this basic dichotomy.

<sup>cx</sup><sub>i</sub> See above

<sup>cx</sup><sub>ii</sub> See specially the last chapter of this book where this argument is fully developed

<sup>cx</sup><sub>iii</sub> both movements of jihad and movements of khurooj: These movements and not the ummah, or Muslim states or other formations are the agents of change in the struggle against capitalist order.

<sup>cx</sup><sub>iv</sub> On the other hand Hindu intellectual and spiritual leadership failed to preserve such incorporation. Modern Hindu fundamentalism thus poses no challenge to capitalism and Western savagery and the Hindu religion has been overwhelmed by nationalism in the same way that classical Judaism has been destroyed by Zionism.

<sup>cx</sup><sub>v</sub> Hazrat Muhajir Makki was not only a scholar and a renowned sufi saint he was also the Amir of the 1857 jihad.

<sup>cx</sup><sub>vi</sub> The ijtiḥād undertaken by Bareilvi and Dewbandi ulema in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century is taqlēdi ijtiḥād.

<sup>cx</sup><sub>vii</sub> It is to be stressed that the tasks of developing an externalist Ghazalian critique and of expanding the scope of the classical Islamic branches of learning to address contemporary issues can only be undertaken by the ulema and soofia. I have not attempted this since it cannot be undertaken by Western educated Muslims.

---

## **Capital**

Capital is takkathur, translated as “rivalry in worldly increase” by Maulana Muhammad Marmaduke Pickthall. This combines the twin characteristics of capitalist order – covetousness and avarice. Capital is not a stock of money neither is it “money in process, commodities in process”. Capital is a vice.

---

### Appendix 1

---

#### **An Islamic Appreciation of Pakistani Modernism: Ideology, Methodology and Strategy\***

America’s quest for global hegemony requires the production and reproduction of a modernizing intelligentsia within dominated societies. Producing and ensuring the intellectual hegemony of such an elite is an increasingly difficult task in an era when the modernist project has all but collapsed. As Brown argues in her recently published “**Politics out of History**” (Princeton 2001) the West “is still grieving the loss of belief in progress, rights, freedom and reason (yet) .... it holds these ideals to be irreplaceable” (p103). Sustaining belief in modernist ideals in the post colonies of the third world is therefore a process ridden with contradiction.

Some of these become evident when one looks at the output of leading Pakistani modernist intellectuals. During 2002 Oxford University Press Pakistan produced three anthologies, Naseem (ed.) “**The Post Colonial State**” (referred to as ‘N’ in this appendix), Mumtaz (ed.) **Pakistan: the Contours of State and Society**



---

(referred to as 'M') and Weiss (ed.) **Power and Civil Society in Pakistan** (referred to as 'W'). These anthologies contain analysis by some of our most important modernists on social, political and philosophical themes. I will in this paper examine their writings with a view to identifying (a) their ideological orientation (b) analytical methodologies employed and (c) policies advocated. My basic concern is to attempt to develop an appreciation of contemporary Pakistani modernism and its relationship to the American quest for subordinating Pakistan within global capitalist order.

### **I. Modernist Ideology in Pakistan**

Pakistani modernist analysis is essentially (but not consistently) materialist in the sense that ultimate causes are invariably identified in terms of consumption and power concerns of agents. All individual and collective agents are conceived of as acting to maximize material gains and outcomes are seen as a consequence of such 'rational' behaviour. This commitment to materialism is evident for example in Feroz Ahmad's essentially Stalinist conception of ethnicity and nationhood (N p22-24) and his conception of state autonomy as a process whereby "the military and the bureaucracy pursue their own interests independently" (p45). "Interests" of ethnic groups are collapsed into class interests on similar grounds – ethnic groups pursue the material interests of the classes to which their dominant numbers belong (N p45-46). Tariq Rahman sees the development of national languages as merely a consequence of their instrumental value in furthering the interest of the 'salariat' – itself defined by means of a vulgarization of Marx's differentiation between physical and mental labour. In Tariq Rahman's view dominant languages are artifacts consciously and exclusively manufactured by the labour of the salariat (N p103). Language is merely an instrument in the (class) struggle to achieve state dominance and Tariq Rahman explains everything (Indian nationalism, partition. Bengali secession, Mohajir Nationalism) on the basis of this absurdly uni dimensional myopia.

Asad Sayeed's analysis of state society conjunction is also unambiguously materialist. His awkward juxtaposition of elite and class interests (N p212) reflects his ideological commitment to materialism as does his simple minded perception of the subordination of the Muslim League hierarchy to feudal 'interests' (N p215). Saiyed sees changes in economic policy to be a consequence of changes in class positions within the state structures – "feudals" were dominant in the Ayub regime and a new 'middle class' became dominant in the 1970s under Bhutto (N p221-223). Policy liberalization is explained as the consequence of the dominance of a new 'finance bourgeoisie' (N p225). Mubarak Ali attributes a change in the religious identity of Indian Muslims from "a passive state to an active one (to) the changing priorities of the ruling classes "(N p330) and the perceived failure of the Muslims to form a 'community' is attributed to the

absence of a common economic interest (N p333) Caste is identified with class again on materialist premises.

Shaheed attributes attitudinal change to “changes in the means and relations of production” (N p345) and presents a materialist interpretation of religious consciousness (N p341). She attributes the emergence of Muslim identity in the 1970s to “the petrodollar boom” (N p348). Her analysis of women’s religious consciousness is unambiguously materialist (N p365-372). Sumar also presents a materialist conception of religious consciousness (N p416-418) and of Islamic law and social practices (N p423-427). The ‘reformists’ dominance of the Pakistani feminist movement is explained “by the nature of the indigenous bourgeoisie to which they belonged (and) its emergence as a class in itself during the 1970s” (N p421). Sumar repeats the standard feudal – religious linkage slander without any reservations (N p429) and Imran Ali also sees Islamic / religious consciousness as a feature of ‘hydraulic’ societies (M pXX). Culture in general is perceived as a “superstructure” sustained by a materialist base (M pXXVII – XXX). Manzoor Ahmad regards Islamic theology as a defense mechanism to ensure the survival of the Muslim community (M p62-64) and Mustafa Kemal Pasha interprets ‘civil society’ in Marxist terms (W p24).

While Pakistani modernists are unambiguously committed to materialism in an over-arching sense they vacillate somewhat uncomfortably between the poles of Marxism and liberalism. Thus Mustafa Kemal Pasha might justifiably be described as a “Marxist liberal” “Behind the edifice of exchange and procedural democracy hide patterns of structural inequality, yet democratization through civil society still offers a better ideal than a statist or authoritarian model” (W p29). Liberal influences (specially those of the neo Weberians) are also reflected in Tariq Rahman’s conception of the role of the bureaucracy (he calls it the salariat) in civil society and in the state (N p108-109). Asad Sayeed’s analysis of large scale manufacturing development is unambiguously neo classical (employing the concept of total factor productivity involving the recognition of ‘capital’ as a factor of production). He also speaks of ‘political equilibrium’ (reminiscent of the work of Robert Bates and of World Bank sponsored political economy) involving a conjuncture between economic strategies and structures of political dominance. Imran Ali regards capitalism as the ‘natural order of things’ (M pXXIII). His derivation of dominant values from social structures (in the NWFP and Balochistan) is unambiguously neo Weberian / Skocpolist. Arshad Zaman’s analysis of macroeconomic policy is merely a neo classical reading of standard macroeconomic data (p169-180). Shafqat endorses liberal values without reservations throughout his paper (M p212-214, 224, 229). Mustafa Kamal Pasha abandons class analysis in his description of social change in Pakistan and instead focuses on ‘Westernizing / non-Westernizing’ social forces. This is a straightforward application of standard modernist theory. Zulfiqar Gilani’s analysis of Pakistani personhood assumes the validity of conventional presumptions of modern psychology. He regards as ‘unnatural’, that which mainstream psychology views as abnormal.

The commitment to liberal ideology (which dominates the policy analysis and recommendations of the Pakistani modernists) provides a basis for the pro imperialist stance of the Pakistani modernists. The themes and nuances of Western policy discourse are uncritically endorsed and Western social formations are idealized as just and progressive. Standard World Bank / IMF reform prescriptions are accepted as necessary (though with qualifications specially regarding reform sequencing). The economy is seen to be on the verge of collapse due to the non implementation of these reforms (Burki W p128, Noman W p170) Asad Sayeed is deeply pessimistic about the country's future economic prospects (N p237-239). Economic failure is seen as a consequence of increased defense expenditure by Feroz Ahmad (N p53) and Imran Ali (M pXIX). Soofia Mumtaz believes that development strategies failed because they explicitly prioritized defense sector needs (M p107) Asad Sayeed repeats World Bank propaganda about project misselection leading to the growth of bank portfolio infection (N p228) and endorses the imperialist view that aid was the main cause of accelerated growth during the 1980s (N p230) despite the evidence to the contrary he himself presents in N Table 3 p226. Both Farida Shaheed and Sabiha Sumar regard women's rights as universal and ahistorical not a requirement of the capitalist need to commodify female labour (N p350) and their frequently used conception of women's "oppression" remains untheorized. Imran Ali repeats imperialist propaganda regarding the consequences of the "population explosion" in Pakistan.

The most explicitly pro imperialist position is taken by Arshad Zaman who puts forward the absurd claim that throughout Pakistan's history "policy has (been) a marketing exercise in pursuit of aid flows" (M p159). He endorses the theory underlying the IMF structural adjustment programmes (M p157, 159) and IMF policy prescriptions are accepted as valid through out the text, (M p166,169,172-3, 180). Zaman offers a strictly one-dimensional analysis of Pakistan's economic policy and performance. In his perspective aid and the quest for aid is the sole determinant of all economic movement in Pakistan (M p162-168).

Imperialist advocacy dovetails with the anti Pakistani stance of many modernist writers. Thus Sumar endorses Sindhi separatism (N p432-433) and Manzur Ahmad shows racial hatred for the indigenous people of Pakistan in stating. "Pakistan as it geographically exists today has been anti intellectual and non rational for ages. (A)ll section of society are incapable of accepting a rational culture "(M p61)". Tariq Rahman sees Urdu as an instrument of oppression legitimizing elite rule and regards ethnic identity assertion as necessarily anti-Urdu (N p117-118). He speaks of (non existing) 'resistance' to Urdu in NWFP and Balochistan (N p109) and (fictional) 'victimization' of Pushto (N p117). Quaid-i-Azam is said to be "have been sent out to East Pakistan" in 1948 by the Urduphiles (N p116). Soofia Mumtaz asserts "the ill success of the original aim of Pakistan to be a separate homeland for Muslims "(M p96) Mustafa Kemal Pasha describes Pakistanis as 'savage' and Pakistani society as 'uncivil' (W p20-21). Zulfiqar Gilani contemptuously describes the Quaid-e-Azam as a "pied piper" (W p59) and Omar Noman

---

calls for the stationing of UN troops to conduct elections in Karachi (W p181) and for the 'de weaponization' of Pakistan (W p183).

Hatred of Pakistan is combined with an even more virulent hatred of Islam. Feroz Ahmad (N p47) and Manzoor Ahmad (M p67-70) misconstrue the relationship of Sufism and Islamic jurisprudence and theology. Sumar's perception of Islam as oppressive and patriarchal leads to deliberate distortion of Islamic legal contracts (e.g. haq-i-meher N p427). She presents a glorified version of Kafir Arabian society (N p427-429). Mubarak Ali presents a Hindu view of Indian Muslim history (N p329-334). He demonstrates contempt for the Ulema (N p333) and denies the existence of a Muslim community identity in Muslim ruled India – in his analysis Muslim identity consciousness appeared miraculously during the independence struggle.

Shaheed denies Islam's universality (N p345) and presents a materialist interpretation of Islamic practices and belief (N p365-362). Imran Ali denigrates the Islamic agenda as espousing "medieval values", Manzoor Ahmad describes "religious leaders (as) intellectual(ly) bankrupt and utter(ly) ignorant of the nuances of a state existing in the twentieth century" (M p64). He denies that "Islam as delineated a thousand years ago has a complete answer to all life problems" (M p60). In Manzoor Ahmad's view Islamic teachings and rituals have no specific validity – they are merely instruments for the attainment of "the social good" (M p65).

Sumar explicitly rejects Islam condemning Islam on the grounds that "patriarchal values are intrinsic to Islam" (N p427). Nighat Khan speaks of Islam as "repressive" and denies the existence of any authentic interpretation of Islam (M p138). She derides Islam for 'not holding the country together' (M p139). She blames Bhutto for 'not renouncing his Muslim identity' (M p143). She describes Islamic legislation as 'retrogressive' (M p149).

Hatred of Islam is fuelled by feminist commitments. Nighat Khan describes herself as 'a socialist feminist' (M p151) and endorses socialist feminist themes without qualifications (M p149-151). Sumar's feminism leads her to describe fornication as "the most basic human right of women" (N p413). Shaheed also endorses feminist ideology unreservedly and evaluates Pakistani social practices on the basis of feminist values – regarding these values as having intrinsic worth and universal validity. These feminist writers are deeply contemptuous of Pakistani society and advocate comprehensive Westernization of all aspects of individual and social life in Pakistan.

### **Modernist Ideology in Pakistan. A Summary**

### **Materialist**

A combination of liberal / neo classical and Marxist / post Marxist themes with liberal perspectives dominant specially with regard to policy advocacy.

### **Pro Imperialist**

Endorses economic strategy of the IMF (with qualifications regarding 'reform' sequencing). Seeks to curtail defense expenditure and dewater Pakistan. Seeks to create a non state in Pakistan on the Bangladeshi model. Endorses separatist movements.

### **Anti Islam**

Denies Islam's universality. Strong hatred of orthodox Islam and of the Ulema. Seeks secularization of society. Endorses feminist discourses

## **II. Methodology**

Modernist ideology provides the basis for the policies advocated by Pakistani modernists.

Have these policies been adequately justified theoretically and empirically? To answer this question I will assess the technical quality of the writings of the Pakistani modernists.

Perhaps the single most striking feature of this work is that it is entirely based on Anglo-American sources. In the three books under review there are approximately 875 references and citations. There is not a single reference to an Urdu, Sindhi or Pushto text. The Pakistani modernists are entirely unaware of our classical texts and of the major theoretical discourses produced in all three languages since the Iranian and the Afghan Islamic revolutions. There are no indigenous modernists writing in English in Pakistan. Pakistani modernists are an alien breed- an imperialist transplant which has failed to take root in Pakistan. The incoherences of the policies they advocate emanate essentially from the social alienation of the Pakistani modernists. Their souls and their minds have migrated to America yet their bodies remain in Pakistan.

The literature drawn upon for developing conceptual frameworks is extremely sparse. Feroz Ahmad's "review of the literature" on relating the concepts of ethnicity and nationhood remains confined to an uncritical paraphrasing of just four texts. Mubarak Ali's Hindu view of Indian Muslim history is merely an

uncritical paraphrase of three texts by W.C Smith, Prabhu Dixit and B.R. Nanda. Asad Sayeed relies exclusively on one paper by Kohli and one book by Migdal (et al) in his analysis of state – society conjunctures. He shows no awareness that his actual analysis departs from the Kohli – Migdal theoretical framework Soofia Mimitaz's only source of South Asian history is one book by Ian Talbot and she dutifully subscribes to all his prejudices (e.g. M p100-101). Papers by Nighat Khan, Farida Shaheed and Sabiha Sumar are similarly narrowly focused and there is in them no critical evaluation or modification of mainstream feminist theory.

This uncritical approach to a handful of Western gurus to whom the Pakistan modernists pay homage leads the later to formulate concepts in a non-rigorous, often incoherent, manner. Thus Feroz Ahmad fails to define "community" and to distinguish and relate it to "ethnic group" and "nationhood". This renders incoherent his view that a redrawing of provincial boundaries is no longer possible or desirable (N p50). Feroz Ahmad asserts that ethnic communities have "rights". (N p54) but does not justify these "rights" Tariq Rahman does not define the concept of "interests" and redefines "class" as constituted by language cleavages without referring to the voluminous literature on this question and without justifying his conceptualization in its context. Asad Sayeed's conception of "the contention for rights" (N p222) leading to the failure of Ayub's industrial strategy is also incoherent as is his attempt at explaining why the industrial bourgeoisie did not resist liberalization. Asad Sayeed does not define "the state" and often confuses / conflates "class" and "elite" (e.g. N p212). His conception of "political balances", "political settlement" and "property rights of dominant classes" are ambiguous and amorphous and cannot serve as a basis for rigorous political analysis. He describes the social structure of West Pakistan as "unique" (N p245) without justification and cannot adequately explain the change in the class composition of the ruling group that Ayub brought about (unless one regards the politicians Ayub displaced as a "class"). The failure to clearly define "state" and "society" renders the conception of conjuncture / disjuncture ambiguous and vague – not unlike the conception of "political equilibrium" conjured up from a misreading of Bates by Shahid Javed Burki (W p127-128). Similarly all talk of "state resurrection" by Sayeed is utterly meaningless. When was the Pakistan state "crucified", how and by whom?

Mubarak Ali confuses "caste" with "class" (N p332). Shaheed does not define "women's oppression" and "ideology". No definition of "religion" is offered by Sumar and she therefore cannot theorize its relationship to "secularization" (N p418) Imran Ali does not define "elite" and speaks loosely of "upper agrarian elements", "nationalist aspirations", "upper peasantry" "smaller landlords" etc. (M pXI,XXI). Culture is defined absurdly as "the software through which a society operates" (M pXXVI). His description of Pakistani social structure is seriously flawed as it omits reference to Punjabi and Sindhi society and generalizes from a description of Pushtun and Baloch tribal life alone. Soofia Mumtaz speaks fleetingly and incomprehensibly of 'competitors in equilibrium' (M p105) without specifying either the nature of the 'competition' or of the 'equilibrium'. She speaks mystifyingly of 'the nationalization of the capital sector'

---

and of Karachi's 'carrying capacity' (M p112). She describes the Sindhi – Mohajir conflict as 'speculative' and 'artificially engineered' (M p115) (why and by whom?). Nighat Khan speaks incoherently of the 'development of women' and of 'theocracy' and claims – but does not demonstrate – how the 'concept of gender has diffused the political edge of the (women's) movement' (M p148). Arshad Zaman does not define "structural change" (M p155) "structural weaknesses" (M p159) "the many crises which beset the polity and the economy" (M p161) "economic bankruptcy" (M p163) "liberalism as a posture" (M p164) "insurmountable methodological problems inhibit(ing) (an assessment of) the contribution of adjustment policies" (M p167) etc.

Saeed Shafqat does not specify "the contradictions in Pakistani society" (M p223) which he laments. He says "the representation of the middle classes has remained marginal in all federal cabinets (during 1985-98)" (p226) but his Table III which describes cabinet composition does not contain the category "middle class" and the share of "lawyers professionals" (usually thought of as 'middle class') averages as high as 41 percent – much higher than the share of the 'middle classes' in Pakistan's population. If 'generals' and 'women' are added to this category the share of the 'middle class' in federal cabinets during 1985-1998 rises to 53 percent. Gilani also does not define "the middle class". Pasha does not define 'Westernization' or the processes by which civil society can be 'guaranteed' by the state (W p33). His conception of the state as being 'an over developed structure of coercion' is not systematically related to Bonapartism and is thus incoherent.

Conceptual ambiguities abound in these texts and they necessarily lead to serious theoretical errors. Feroz Ahmad presents an essentially Stalinist conception of nationhood without excavating its genealogy – i.e. its relationship to and departure from Marxist – Hegelian conceptions. He cannot therefore appreciate its limitations. He attempts a partial departure from this Stalinist conception but cannot escape it in for example his analysis of the situation of the Urdu speaking community. He vacillates between classical Marxism and post modernism for while class remains central to his analysis, he can write "concepts, rather than being right or wrong, are appropriate, inappropriate more appropriate, less appropriate" (N p39). His identification of 'language' with 'culture' in demarcating ethnic groups in Pakistan is not theoretically justified – it is a pragmatic hunch, which he believes is "appropriate / more appropriate". Factors affecting ethnic consciousness are arbitrarily ignored in his 'alternative framework' for the analysis of the nationality question (N p29-33).

Feroz Ahmad is not conscious of the basic contradiction underlying his conception of state autonomy. He identifies "the state" with the military and bureaucracy on N p44 but accuses them of "plundering the resources of the state in their own interests" (N p45). If the state is a part of capitalist order (as both Alavi and Feroz Ahmad accept) its fundamental commitment must be to capital accumulation. No dominant

---

“class” can supercede this commitment (unless it is willing to detach its state from capitalist order). To speak of the ‘autonomy’ of the state in terms of the ‘autonomy’ of the military – bureaucracy from capital (the market) is highly problematic. Justifying state ‘autonomy’ requires much more profound analysis (as Kalecki shows) than Feorz Ahmad can provide. The concept of ‘state autonomy’ becomes entirely incoherent when Feroz Ahmad changes his implicit definition of the state and includes ‘the landlord class, the capitalist class, military and bureaucracy as elements of the ruling class’ (N p45). If all dominant classes rule in what sense can ‘the state’ be regarded as ‘autonomous’?

Feroz Ahmad returns to his Stalinist roots when he simply collapses his concept of ethnicity into class. Crucially missing is a discussion of the role ‘dominated classes’ play in ethnic political struggle. His litany of demands (N p49-50) is not related to the foregoing theory. Feroz Ahmad admits his inability to theorize the role of ethnicity in capitalist state formations when he states “ethnic identities are too fluid in Pakistan to be addressed by a (theoretical) framework requiring rigid definitions” (N p50). Feroz Ahmad does not come up to the standards set by his master. Paul Brass for he cannot provide a theoretical framework for understanding the relationship of ethnicity to nationalism.

Tariq Rahman provides no theoretical justification for his absurdly uni dimensional view of the social and political dominance of the salariat. Enlightenment epistemological dominance in colonial India is seen as merely the dominance of a language and no evidence is presented to justify this amazing distortion – Syed Ahmad Khan and his acolytes “bought” not just English as Tariq Rahman asserts but all subjects from the British with the exception of theology and (partially) esthetics. There is no theoretical justification for seeing language policy as the sole determinant of changes in the power structure or for the view that language alone is constitutive of class or ethnic identity.

Asad Sayeed’s conception of the state is contradictory because the relationship of the military – bureaucracy (which is often implicitly regarded to be the state) and the “dominant class” is not theorized. Indeed his use of the concept of the “dominant class” is vacuous and its identity is often not revealed, for example in the Ayub era virtually all classes except the masses are seen as constituting “the dominant coalition” (N p218-220). The “disjunctural” character of the Zia regime is not established for aid did not run out for Zia as it did for Ayub. There is no attempt at theorizing the Zia period within the context of Migdal’s analytical framework (which is supposed to be Sayeed’s underlying theory) and no explanation emerges for the decline in productivity during the Zia era. There is a marked “disjuncture” in Sayeed’s paper. Section 1 is a simple neo classical analysis of the performance of the large scale-manufacturing sector. It is not related in any way to section II and III which say almost nothing about large-scale manufacturing.



---

Mubarak Ali's theory about lack of identity consciousness among Indian Muslims breaks down when he is forced to admit the identification of the indigenous Muslims with the Islamic cause in the nineteenth century. His materialist / pseudo Marxist theory cannot identify the "interests" which are supposed to have called the Indian Muslim community into being suddenly in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Indeed Mubarak Ali has to abandon "material interests" and speak of "emotional needs" when discussing the evolution of the Muslim community in colonial times. Mubarak Ali's failure to explain this phenomenon illustrates the essentially a theoretical, character of his analysis.

Farida Shaheed contradicts herself through out her paper. Her survey of women's attitudes is based on convenience sampling and her results are therefore not generalizable, yet she does not refrain from drawing general conclusions. Moreover her survey is based on deceit and subterfuge – respondents were not directly asked questions on religion and politics, (N p352) therefore inferences about the respondents religious / political attitudes reflect the prejudices of the interviewers and of Shaheed herself. Shaheed's "post modernist" turn (N p380-382) advocating recognition of multiple identities and the "redefinition of all markers of identity" (N p380) is incoherent because it is not based on the findings of the foregoing survey (which are in any case not generalizable) or on any explicit theoretical justification.

Imran Ali's materialist explanation of social stratification breaks down when he acknowledges, "imagined communal affiliation" between Indian Muslims and Muslims from Central Asia and Arabia. Nor is he able to theorize the transition from "caste" to "class" – specially the appearance of the "bourgeoisie". He is unable to provide any systematic framework for relating social change (normative and structural) to economic development – the central concern of his paper. The discussion of social change and norms is left hanging in the air and the essay ends inconclusively.

Manzoor Ahmad's description of ideological evolution is entirely atheoretical as is Soofia Mumtaz's analysis of the emergence of ethnicity in Sindh. She can provide no explanation of the transition of the Mohajir 'community' from Pakistani nationalist to ethnic consciousness. On M p150 Nighat Khan stigmatizes "the present model of development as..... materialistic" despite the essentially materialist character of her own analysis. Arshad Zaman is committed to neo classicism (and imperialism) but he cannot evaluate policy effectiveness in terms of the movement of the macroeconomic variables in his tables – a reading of these tables masquerades as analysis in his text. Saeed Shafqat avoids reference to any explicit theoretical framework. Although his liberal prejudices pock mark his text, he cannot provide any theoretical explanation for the 'contradictions' (specially in the behaviour of politicians) which he laments. Zulfiqar Gilani reproduces orthodox psychological conventional wisdom without any attempt at modification or reformulation to suit the Pakistani psycho-social environment. The data on the basis of

---

which his sweeping generalizations are developed is not presented anywhere in the text and there is no way to ascertain its representativeness.

Sweeping, unproved generalization are scattered throughout these texts. Feroz Ahmad provides no proof for the view that all major ethnic groups in Pakistan are characterized by ethnic self consciousness (N p391). No evidence of inter ethnic disparities is presented anywhere in his text. Nor is any evidence presented about “the leveling of social norms and practices across ethnic boundaries”(N p42) or about standardization of religious practices and growth of orthodoxy (N p42-43).

Asad Sayeed provides no proof (not even a reference) for his view that policies of the 1950s were fully implemented. The ‘swelling of middle classes’ (N p220) is not proved since the difference in the rate of growth of urban and rural population (on the basis of which the ‘swelling of the middle class’ is premised) is statistically insignificant. No statistics are presented to demonstrate “the precipitous increase in the number of lawyers, the salariat and students” (N p221). Property rights created by the Ayub regime are not described – so we do not know what “classes” they constituted and are unable to understand the nature of “the challenge of the middle class” (N p222). Nor is there any evidence to show that the middle classes become “dominant” (N p223). The assertion that the debt equity ratio rose in Zia’s time (in relation to earlier periods) is not substantiated (N p224). No proof is offered for the ‘emergence of factions’ in Zia’s regimes or of ‘the pay off’ they received.

Mubarak Ali is unable to demonstrate the political dominance of the immigrants in the immediate post independence era. Sumar’s paper is full of unproven generalizations such as “the differential impact of religious laws has principally to do with the question of the balance of power between the religious establishment and civil society” (N p416) “women’s organizations have conceded (sic) the existing distribution of power” (N p419) “women from the working classes in Pakistan do not share the utopian concept of feminism” (N p434). Sumar is not conscious of the need to define key concepts – “civil society”, “balance of power”, “distribution of power”, “utopian feminism” etc. – for such sentences to have any meaning.

Imran Ali writes without proof of “the triad being strengthened by hydraulic society” (M PXXIII) and repeats imperialist propaganda about the apocalyptic consequences of the “failure to manage and in a rational way to control population” (M pXXIV). He describes military expenditure as “completely untenable” (M pXXXV). He states that “society’s upper element is sitting like an incubus on society” (M pXXV). This is the language of fantasy. It scorns cold logic and spurns any reference to facts.

---

Manzoor Ahmad offers no proof for his absurd opinion that “the dread of disintegration seemed to have seized the collective mind of the ummah” (M p58) and that the “victory” of transcendent theology was due to this dread. Soofia Mumtaz speaks vaguely of “the distorted relationship between the centre and the provinces” (M p125) without specifying the nature of the distortion. Nighat Khan provides no evidence for her claim that “Pakistan is suffering a full scale sectarian war” (M p137) or for her view that “Islamic fundamentalism was created by global capitalism” (M p138). She argues without any evidence that “non Muslims are now only nominal citizens” (M p142). Statements such as “the state moved over to take control of the bodies of women” (M p142). “(Islamization) has made everyone other than in one’s own community, the ‘other’” (p143) are essentially rhetorical expressions of the emotions of the author.

Arshad Zaman presents no proof to show that “the budget is the root of all economic problems in Pakistan” (M p157) or for the demonstrably false view that “throughout the fifty years of Pakistan the performance of agriculture and the volume of military and economic assistance received have been the proximate determinants of economic performance” (M p159). He describes the First Plan “as lacking political ownership and therefore entirely unfeasible” (M p161). He provides no sources for the data in the graphs reproduced on M p170-78 and Table III on M p179 provides no evidence about Pakistan’s “monopoly power” in world markets as he claims. Saeed Shafqat says “civil society has yet to stabilize” (M p209) without explicating this concept. He argues that “the district administration has become highly politicized, coercive and partisan” (M p219) but provides no evidence to substantiate this claim. Mustafa Kamal Pasha describes the Pakistan state as “overly intrusive” “an overdeveloped instrument of coercion”, “(unable) to guarantee civil society” (W p32) – all unsubstantiated generalizations. He claims that “the military high command is increasingly distinct from the metropolis in thinking, habits and tastes” (M p33) “power and privilege are no longer the preserve of a Westernized elite” (W p35), “the new middle class perceives itself as quite skilled in positioning itself to modernity” (W p35) “social Darwinism has become the abiding principle of Pakistan society” (W p57). “The state has been an arena of universal egoism” (W p35) “the economy has begun to acquire an autonomy from society” (W p39) “the consolidation of a market based logic permeating... the family and biradari” (W p43). No proof is offered to substantiate any of these generalizations. Similar unsubstantiated generalizations also litter the text of Zulfiqar Gilani’s paper (W p49,50,51,53,54,56,57,58,60,61).

Serious theoretical errors and unfounded generalizations ensure that Pakistani modernist authors are often unable to answer important questions their analysis raises implicitly or explicitly. Thus Feroz Ahmad cannot tell us why the attribute of nationhood or ethnic consciousness should confer the right of self determination on a people. He cannot address any of the key questions (raised on N p43) regarding the sharing of state power among ethnic groups, the relationship between ethnicity and the state and the interaction between class and ethnicity. Tariq Rahman cannot explain why the Muslim salariat “choose”

---

Urdu (p115) as the instrument for establishing its hegemony, rather than some other regional language. Addressing this question would require a necessary departure from his uni dimensional analytical framework.

Asad Sayeed cannot provide a reconciliation of the dominance of the capitalist mode of production and the (simultaneous) autonomy of the state – both of which he asserts – his description of policy choices is thus rendered incoherent. He cannot explain class formation processes – for example why the middle class became “a class for itself” under Bhutto and stopped being so under Zia. His explanation of “pay off” to prevent dissent is also incoherent, why was nationalization of finance not required in the Ayub era as a pay off mechanism? Inadequate theorization is also reflected in Sayeed’s loose formulations regarding the state society nexus, “social forces” are often substituted for society (neither being rigorously defined) and the “class composition” of the state is never precisely explicated. His view of the liberalization strategy as a means by the state to “divert demand from powerful factions towards the private sector” (N p232) is unclear – is he speaking of the ‘criminalization of the economy’ or ‘a retreat of the state’ or an amalgam of both these phenomena or of something else?

Mubarak Ali cannot explain the growth of Islamic consciousness of locally converted Muslims in the nineteenth century, given the racialism he attributes to the Ulema and the foreign origin Muslims (N p334). Why did the lower caste Muslim feel threatened by the missionaries etc. (N p335) if they were not part of the Indian Muslim community? Why did they accept the leadership of the Ulema? Why, if they were not a community did the lower caste Muslims articulate “a thirst for recognition”. Why were appeals for safeguarding Muslim identity popular? None of these questions can be addressed within the context of the Hindu view of Indian Muslim history which Mubarak Ali presents.

Imran Ali has no coherent explanation for the “ elite failure” or “the cultural malaise” which supposedly prevails in Pakistan. He cannot identify the impact of specific forms of social structuring on value formation in Pakistani society. Soofia Mumtaz cannot explain why ethnic consciousness did not emerge in the 1950s, among the Mohajirs surely a crucial question for her analysis. She cannot adequately periodise the substitution of an ethnic for a national identity among the Mohajirs (N p114,115) or sub groups such as the Memons (N p105). Saeed Shafqat fails to answer any of the questions he raises on M p210 “the relationship between democratic transition and political transition, the forces of resistance and support to democracy, the role of political parties in promoting or hampering development” – none of these forces and processes are systematically analyzed in his paper which entirely lacks a theoretical framework – liberal prejudices cannot adequately substitute for political theory.

### **III. Policies**

Policies advocated by the Pakistani modernists are neither theoretically grounded nor based on methodologically sound estimations of socio economic trends. These policies reflect merely the prejudices of the authors. They do however provide important clues to the mindset of the Pakistani modernists who today dominate state policymaking.

As far as economic policy is concerned there is a straight forward endorsement of the IMF standard poverty growth (PRGF) packages (with some reservations about sequencing of financial and fiscal policy changes). Thus Burki calls for debt rescheduling, privatization, current and capital account liberalization, worker and union suppression, financial sector liberalization and a drastic cut in the size of the state (W p117-120). Noman regards the IMF reforms as necessary (though not sufficient) for economic revival (W p168). He is also a strong supporter of financial sector privatization and subordination to globalization. Arshad Zaman arguing from strictly neo classical premises also endorse IMF policy prescriptions (M p157).

Pakistani modernists argue that overcoming economic and social “crises” requires thoroughgoing Westernization. Commitment to Westernization is reflected in Tariq Rahman’s condemnation of Urdu which he argues was imposed by the British imperialists on the Punjab, Balochistan and the NWFP (N p107). According to Rahman the Pakistani elite continues to use Urdu as an instrument for suppressing ethnic minorities and there is popular widespread resistance to Urdu in Sindh, NWFP and Balochistan. The implication is that Urdu should be discarded as Pakistan’s national language and this will greatly facilitate the Westernization of Pakistan society. Shaheed strongly apposes single sex schools and advocates gender de-segregation of the education and health sectors. She applauds the defeminization of society and the commodification of female labour. She is a strong opponent of the veil and of the Islamization of laws and social practices (N p369-370). Emulation of Western norms and practices by Pakistani elite women are enthusiastically applauded by Shaheed. Sabiha Sumar regards the “fidelity of women to their marriage vows as an evil characteristic of patriarchy”. (N p425-426). She ridicules chastity and regards fornication as a “human right” (N p413). She idealizes prostitutes. In her view they are front line and effective fighters against the Islamic state and therefore serve as role models for all women in Pakistan (N p432-435).

Manzoor Ahmad advocates the development of a liberal political order through an epistemological corruption of traditional Islam and an incorporation of urban Islamic movements into liberal governance processes. A revival of the defunct Mutazilite heresy is seen as possible in South Asia and as necessary for the Westernization of Islamic society. Sir Syed’s theological work is according to Manzoor Ahmad an indispensable basis for submerging Islam within Western civilization (M p69-72) Zulfiqar Gilani’s account of psychological development of Pakistani personhood presumes the desirability of the core Western values of autonomy and self assertiveness Pakistani society is described as “pervaded by a strong sense of ennui”

(W p62) because child rearing in Pakistan does not conform to Western norms. The “normal” human being is the typical citizen of a Westernized democratic polity (W p55-57).

Advocacy of Westernization culminates in the acceptance of Western norms as universally valid. Thus human rights are not seen as instruments used / duties undertaken by capitalist states to sustain capitalist individuation and market society – they are regarded as sanctioned by reason. The ethnic rights advocated by Feroz Ahmad (N p49-50), linguistic rights of minorities recognized by Tariq Rahman and above all “rights of women” asserted by Shaheed, Sumar and Nighat Khan are all derived from this ideological commitment to the universality of human rights doctrine. Paradoxically this is specially evident in Nighat Khan’s complete and unreserved endorsement of socialist feminism (M p149) – she is not even dimly aware of Marx’s contradictory position on the nature of rights in the **“Critique of the Gotha Program”** and in **“The German Ideology”**.

An acceptance of the universality of Western norms and practices naturally leads the Pakistani modernists to a principled apposition of the Ulema. Mubarak Ali describes the Ulema as racists – “fulminating” against Hindus and having a “particularly hostile attitude towards newly converted Muslims” (N p333). In Manzoor Ahmad’s view the Ulema were the servants of West Pakistani feudal lords. “Islam as interpreted by the conservative theologians was supportive of a feudal and tribal cultural milieu. Islam helped to maintain the status quo” (M p60). There is therefore a need to reject” (the) Islam (which) represents a theological structure where God is wholly transcendent” (M p64) and distort Islamic teachings to justify pantheism and man’s participation in the act of creation (M p66).

Shaheed is contemptuous of chastity as a virtue (N p373) and argues strongly for a repeal of the Hudood Ordinance (N p375) specially sections relating to the treatment of fornication (footnote 33). Sumar is the Chairperson of the Committee for the Repeal of the Hudood Ordinance. She explicitly rejects Islam and describes its as a patriarchal system developed to justify feudal property rights (N p415-418). She regards Islam as the main threat to the promotion of women’s rights and argues that struggling against Islam should be the prime concern of the women’s movement (N p425,436-438). Nighat Khan’s espousal of socialist feminism is also based on a rejection of the authenticity of Islamic doctrine and on the recognition of a need to struggle against Islam. The need to suppress Islamic movements is strongly emphasized by Nighat Khan (M p135-138).

The Pakistani modernists believe that integrating within. Western civilization requires the disempowering of the state. Several authors – Feroz Ahmad, Asad Sayeed, Imran Ali, Sahhid Javed Burki, Farida Shaheed, Soofia Mumtaz, Saeed Shafqat – emphasize the need for a drastic reduction in defense expenditure and unilateral disarmament. Disempowering the Pakistani state also requires devolution of power. Burki describes this as a process of breaking up federal and provincial authority and creating local administrative units with the power to tax (W p160-161). Noman sees devolution as creating political space for giving

NGOs a governing role. As Charles Kennedy has often reminded us, it is the intervention of the NGOs, which has created a non-state in Bangladesh. Noman argues that the growth of the governance capability of the imperialist financed NGOs should be accompanied by a thorough going submission of the state to human rights imperialism – suppression of religious groups, establishment of the monopoly control of the global media, de-feminization etc.

Noman goes further. Devolution and the introduction of liberal democratic practices are not enough for creating a non-state in Pakistan. He argues that the UN should be given the responsibility of “de weaponization” of first Karachi and then throughout Pakistan (W p182). The UN should organize elections in Pakistan (W p183). Debt rescheduling should be linked to progressive secularization of society (W p180-181) and enhanced governmental authority of imperialist financed advocacy agencies such as the Sustainable Policy Development Institute (W p183-184). The government should be forced to meet its commitments on reducing armed expenditure and secularization of society as conceived at the Copenhagen Social Summit and the Jontein Conference (W p181). In effect, Pakistan should become a UN protectorate – like Palestine, Syria and Iraq in the inter war period and Namibia in recent years. In all probability the UN will award the mandate to govern Pakistan to its nearest and newest permanent security council member, India. Forward to the Bhutanization of Pakistan.

#### **Pakistani Modernists’ Policy Recommendations**

- Continue IMF style structural adjustment with sequential modifications.
- Social strategy should be to create a rights centric civil society modeled on the social order of the Western democracies.
- Strong emphasis on defeminization and commodification of female labour.
- Secularization of Islam and suppression of orthodox Islamic movements.
- Disempowerment of the state leading to the Bhutanization of Pakistan.

#### **IV. Conclusions**

An analysis of the work of the leading Pakistani modernists reveals the following characteristics of the outlook and strategy of this power elite.

- 
- Pakistani modernists are strongly committed to Western civilization. They accept the universalist claims of enlightenment ontology and epistemology. They are not conscious of the contradictions and incoherences of modernist discourse. They regard the questioning of this discourse as irrational and the universalization of modernist practices as both desirable and inevitable.
  - This ideological commitment to modernism induces them to close their eyes to the problems associated with universalizing modernist rationality. The innumerable technical flaws, which litter their writings, reflect this ideological “blindness”. It is not that these authors are technically incompetent. It is their ideological commitment to the universalization of the modernist project which makes it impossible for them to admit the many theoretical caveats that restrict the scope of their argument.
  - The essential commitment of the Pakistani modernists is to Pakistan’s subordination to liberal imperialism and to America. Primarily they are advocates of this subordination not experts and functionaries who will bring it about. As advocates, their principle concern is agitation and propaganda. They have to create a sense of crisis where none exists – Pakistani society is “uncivil”, the Pakistani economy is “collapsing”, Pakistan is “bankrupt”, there is “institutional breakdown”, Karachi is “devastated”, there is universal “despair” – ad infinitum. In agitprop work it is not facts that are important, what is important is the skilful distortion of facts. The imperialist mandate given to the Pakistan modernists by America is to convince the military and political leadership that things are desperately wrong and to nurture a sense of panic. Imperialist demands must be accepted immediately and without conditions or no time will be left.
  - But paradoxically the “solution” advocated is worse than the (fictitious) “problems” identified by the Pakistani modernists. The solution is the Bhutanization of Pakistan – the betrayal of Kashmir, the acceptance of Indian regional hegemony, the de-Islamization of society, strengthening the political stranglehold of the types of imperialist financed NGOs, which have turned Bangladesh into a non-state. If this is a recipe for avoiding disaster one wonders what can be a greater disaster, for Pakistan than this Bhutanization.





---

## Appendix 2

### Marxist Ideals

---

I will try to describe the ideal society as pictured by Marx. This is not an easy task for a single coherent statement of socialist society is not to be found in his work. I will therefore piece together a somewhat blurred picture from several writings. I am confident that while people may dispute some details and interpretations the major<sup>cxvii</sup> characteristics of socialist society, as pieced together in the following analysis are substantially accurate and beyond dispute<sup>cxvii</sup>.

Marx sharply distinguishes between two distinct stages in the development of his ideal society. The first stage which is “Socialist” is described in some detail<sup>cxvii</sup>. It is characterized by the existence of ‘the dictatorship of the proletariat’ and has the following features.

- i. Abolition of private property (specially in land) and inheritance laws.
- ii. Progressive taxation.
- iii. Centralization of credit in the hands of the state
- iv. Equal liability of all to labour.
- v. Rapid industrialization and the right to free education

The purpose of these changes is to “wrest all capital from the bourgeoisie, to centralize all instruments of production in the hands of the state and to increase the total of productive forces as rapidly as possible”<sup>cxvii</sup>. The dictatorship of the proletariat is to be exercised in alliance with the peasantry which should be won over (not coerced) to accept the collectivization strategy implied by the abolition of private property in land.

Despite the abolition of private property Marx envisages the existence of considerable inequality of income in the socialist, transitional<sup>cxvii</sup> society – his proposals for progressive taxation and centralization of credit are designed to check this inequality and the autonomy of enterprises<sup>cxvii</sup>. Reduction in income

---

inequalities are accompanied by a tremendous increase in the rate of development. This allows society to create new economic arrangements<sup>cxvii</sup> which lead to the abolition of the antagonism between town and country<sup>cxvii</sup> and is a first step toward the abolition of the division of labour<sup>cxvii</sup>

The political organization of the transitional socialist state was briefly sketched by Marx. This state is characterized by the dictatorship of the proletariat from the time of the overthrow of capitalism to the full establishment of communist society. The dictatorship of the proletariat is “the democratic rule of the entire working class (including farm workers) which makes up a large proportion<sup>cxvii</sup> of the population of all advanced countries”. The dictatorship of the proletariat has been described as “a permanent revolution (where) the remains of the old order (are destroyed) by the state using all the force that is necessary for this purpose”. It is modeled on the Paris Commune of 1871 which was “the political form at last discovered under which to work out the economic emancipation of labour”<sup>cxvii</sup>. According to Marx, the Commune:

1. Was formed of municipal councilors elected on the basis of universal suffrage. These councilors were at all times recallable.
2. Functioned as both an executive and a legislative body.
3. All administrative official, police, accountants and judges were elective, responsible and recallable by the commune councilors.
4. The army was disbanded and replaced by the armed people.

The vision is therefore of a political society in which there are frequent elections and referenda, people are capable of clearly mandating their representatives who are not corrupted by power<sup>cxvii</sup>. A standing army is unnecessary because “communism is only possible as the act of the dominant people, simultaneously”<sup>cxvii</sup>. This means that Marx expected a world socialist revolution at the outset of the development of the transitional socialist society<sup>cxvii</sup>.

Once the socialist revolution has succeeded there is an almost immediate improvement in working conditions. The working day is cut by fifty percent<sup>cxvii</sup> but there is a rapid increase in production. This happens because the socialist revolution is supposed to take place in the most industrially advanced areas – Marx’s proletariat unlike Lenin’s does not have to build the material basis for socialist society. Planning strikes an efficient dynamic balance between growing resources and growing needs<sup>cxvii</sup>. Real wages and the proportion of the social product allocated to the individual labourer rises rapidly<sup>cxvii</sup>. Moreover the measure guiding distribution during the socialist transitional phase will be labour time. Each labourer will receive a voucher entitling him to obtain an amount of commodities from the social fund equivalent to the time he has spent in production. These vouchers will not circulate and means of production and social means of consumption – such as trains – will not be for sale. The role of money will gradually be reduced

---

during the socialist transitional phase<sup>cxvii</sup>. But despite this there will be both private accumulation and income inequalities during the socialist transitional phase although classes will gradually disappear<sup>cxvii</sup>.

This transitional socialism gradually give way to full blown communism. Communism is made possible by a fundamental change in the morality of the people which deprives the dictatorship of the proletariat of its raison d'être. This moral transformation is the result of a superabundance of wealth made possible by the outstanding success of planning and phenomenal technological advance. Communism is characterized by:

1. The elimination of the division of labour.
2. Activity with and for others becomes a prime want of every individual.
3. Social ownership is extended to all natural objects. (including items of personal consumption).
4. Total human mastery over nature.
5. The end of all organization of human activity except productive activity (the realm of necessity).
6. The elimination of all coercion and punishment.
7. The disappearance of all divisions within humanity – family, race, nation, the rural-urban divide, occupation and class.

The individual's victory over the division of labour is undoubtedly the chief characteristic of full blown communist society. The individual "needs the totality of human life activities"<sup>cxvii</sup> and "the anti thesis between mental and physical labour has vanished"<sup>cxvii</sup>. Everyone participates in factory work and in the production and consumption of culture and science because he wants to. Communism will see a flowering of the talent of ordinary people. Everyone will not only perform many tasks they will perform them extra ordinarily well<sup>cxvii</sup>.

These very highly talented individuals will show a very high degree of co-operation and mutual concern. Each individual is conscious of humanity as being part of himself. Man sees himself as a specie being and "society is man himself in social relation"<sup>cxvii</sup>. However communist man's concern for others is not associated with any sense of duty but rather with the satisfaction one gets oneself in helping others. The individual recognizes the other as part of his own being. No conflict between individuals is conceivable since scarcity has been abolished and each can have what he wants just for the asking. The community stores are replete with everything and there is never a matter of an individual depriving himself for the sake of others. Private property disappears, in other words due to the disappearance of scarcity.

Scarcity is overcome by the conquest of nature. The supremacy of "the individual over chance and over objective conditions"<sup>cxvii</sup> is established in Communism. Natural science and human service are fused into

---

one<sup>cxvii</sup> and the individual is able to do all that he wants to do. Nature becomes “man’s own real body”<sup>cxvii</sup>. Man “consciously (strips) all natural processes of their natural character and subjugates them to the power of individuals”<sup>cxvii</sup>. Man becomes a creator and the whole world is his creation”<sup>cxvii</sup>. As all individuals are equal creators, organization and leadership necessarily disappear. Even in the factories the managers function only as the conductor of a willing orchestra<sup>cxvii</sup>. Every worker gets to become a manager when he chooses. Laziness dies a “natural death” and “from each according to his ability and to each according to his needs” is a maxim nobody thinks of denying under full blown Communism<sup>cxvii</sup>. Work gradually becomes “the activity of real freedom,”<sup>cxvii</sup> “positive power to assert man’s individuality”<sup>cxvii</sup>. Work is an instrument for the realization of this freedom. It is uncoerced and does not require authority.

The withering away of coercion finds fullest expression in the withering away of the institutions of the state-judicial, legislative and executive. It was the state in the form of the dictatorship of the proletariat that was instrumental in the over throw of capitalism and in the transition to communism, but once communism is reached the state like Wittgenstein’s ladder is “thrown away”. Retributive justice has no place in the communist order. Lapses from co-operative behaviour are “punished: solely by self inflicted guilt. Others-society-will help relieve the anguish an individual inflicts on himself, through failing to live up to generally accepted standards<sup>cxvii</sup>. These standards are universally accepted. Communist people agree on all major subjects once the structure of communist society has been formally established.

The withering away of the state is an aspect of the withering away of all divisions in society. “The witchery of religion”<sup>cxvii</sup> is no more. all nations<sup>cxvii</sup> and races have disappeared. The bourgeois family is replaced by group living, monogamous sexual relationships and the communal raising of children. Sex in communist society is always associated with love and love is an exclusive – some times permanent, sometimes temporary relationship between one man and one woman<sup>cxvii</sup>. Universal love which is described as the basis of social co-operation apparently does not include free sexual activity<sup>cxvii</sup>. Monogamous sexual love in communist society is the measure of perfection for all other relationships<sup>cxvii</sup>. The love of parents for children and of children for parents has no place in the communist utopia.

---

### **References**

- Abdel Nour F. (2004) "Farewell to Justification" **Philosophy and Social Criticism** Vol. 30 No.1 p73-96.
- Agleitta M. (1999) **Theory of Capitalist Accumulation: the US Experience** London Verso
- Algar H. (1978) "Ali Shariati: A Bibliographical Sketch" in Shariati A. On the Sociology of Islam Berkeley, Mizan
- Ansari J, Naeem M, Zubairi J. (2005) **Financial Management in Pakistan** Karachi Oxford University Press
- Ansari J. (2002) **Maghribi Tahzeeb** Sheikh Zayed Centre, University of the Punjab Lahore.
- Aristotle (1958) **The Politics** Harmondsworth Penguin
- Badiou A. (2001) Ethics An Enquiry into the Nature of Evil Verso London
- Baudrillard J. (1998) **The Consumer Society: Myth and Structure** London Sage
- Bell D. (1976) **The Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism** London Heinman
- Bhabha H. (1991) "Locations of Culture" in Malpas S. (ed.) The Post Modern and the Post Colonial Debates New York Palgrave
- Binder L. (1983) Islamic Liberalism New York, Cambridge University Press
- Blinder A. (1998) **Central Banking in Theory and Practise** London Cambridge University Press
- Brenner R. (1998) "The Economics of Global Turbulence" **New Left Review** 1:229 p1-264.

- 
- Brentano F. (1948) **Psychology from an Empirical Standpoint** (translator A. Rancullero) Macmillan London.
- Brerzenski Z. (1997) **The Grand Chess Board** New York Colombia University Press
- Brown W. (2001) **Politics Out of History** Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Butler J. (1997) **The Psychic Life of Power** Stanford, Stanford University Press
- Callinicos A. (1999) **Social Theory** Cambridge Polity
- Chomsky N. (1998) "Power in the Global Arena" **New Left Review** 1: 230 p3-27.
- Coles R. (1997) **Rethinking Generosity** Ithaca Cornell University Press
- Conor E. (1998) **Communications, Commerce and Peace** London Cambridge University Press
- Cook S. (et al) (1992) **Post Modernization: Change in Advanced Society** London Sage
- De Beauvoir S. (1964) **The Second Sex** (Translator C. Fox) Mentor New York
- Dee J. (1970) **Bury My Heart At Wounded Knee** Harmondsworth Penguin
- Derida J. (1976) **Grammatology** Baltimore John Hopkins University Press
- Dohrendorff R. (1996) "Economic Opportunity, Civil Society and Political Liberty" **Development and Change** Vol. 27 No.3 p229-249
- Donnelly J. (1988) **Universal Human Rights** Stanford, Stanford University Press
- Dreben B. (2003) "On Rawls and Political Liberalism" in Freeman C. (ed) **The Cambridge Companion to Rawls** London Cambridge University Press
- Dworkin R. (1978) "Liberalism" in S. Hampshire (ed) **Public and Private Morality** OUP London pp. 113-164 A. Dunford (1998).
- Eagleton T. (2003) **After Theory** London Allene Lane

- 
- Easton D. (1971) **The Political System** New York Knopff
- Elister J. (1993) **Constitutionalism and Democracy** London Cambridge University Press
- Euben R. (1999) **The Enemy in the Mirror** New York Oxford University Press
- Fairbrother F. (1994) "The New Industrial Relations and Class Struggles in the 1980s" **Capital and Class** No. 61 pp.107-141.
- Fairbrother F. (1996) "Workplace Trade Unionism In the Public Sector": in P. Ackers **New Workplace Trade Unionism** London Routledge pp.110 - 145.
- Fine B. (1997) "The New Revolution In Economics" **Capital and Class** No. 71 p.141-156.
- Foucault M (1978) **Discipline and Punish** Pantheon, New York
- Foucault M. (1973) **The Order of Things** Vantage Books New York
- Foucault M. (1980) **Power / Knowledge Selected Interviews** Brighton Harvester Press
- Foucault M. (1984a) "What is Enlightenment" in Rabinow F. (ed.) **The Foucault Reader** Harmondsworth Penguin.
- Foucault M. (1984b) "Nietzsche Genealogy and History" in Rabinow (1984)
- Fuerbach F. (1954) **The Essence of Christianity** Allen and Unwin London
- Gall C. (1998) "Resisting the Rise of Non Unionism" **Capital and Class** No. 64 pp. 43-62
- Gould C. (1980) **Marx's Social Ontology** Routledge London
- Govt. of Pakistan (PES) (200) **Pakistan Economic Survey** 1999 / 2000 Ministry of Finance, Islamabad.
- Gray J. (1995) **Enlightenment's Wake** Granta London
- Gray J. (1999) **False Dawn** London Granta
- Habermas J. (1973) **Wirklickkeit und Reflexion** P. Fallingen Ganther Neski



- 
- Habermas J. (1987) **The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity** Cambridge Man MIT Press.
- Habermas J. (1991) **On the logic of the Social Sciences** Cambridge Polity
- Habermas J. (1999) **The Post National Constellation** London Verso
- Habermas J. (2001) **Knowledge and Human Interest** Cambridge Mass MIT Press
- Hayek F. (1979) **Law, Legislation and Liberty** Vol. 111 London Routledge
- Hegel F. (1952) **The Philosophy of Right** Clarendon Press Oxford
- Heidegger M. (1967) **Being and Time** Translator J. Maaquarrie and E. Robinson Free Press, New York
- Hi. Qunglian (2000) "China's Listing Social Structure" **New Left Review** 11.5 p 69-100
- Hirschman A. (1977) **The Passions and the Interests** Princeton, Princeton University Press
- Hirst P. and D. Thompson (1997) **Globalization in Question** Cambridge Polity
- Holland N. (1997) **Feminist Interpretations of Jacques Derrida** Pittsburgh Pennsylvania University Press
- Hudson W. (1970) **Modern Moral Philosophy** New York Anchor
- Hume D. (1951) **A Treatise on Human Nature** London OUP
- Hunt I and Ignateiff M. (1983) ed. **Wealth and Virtue** London OUP
- Irrigary L. (1985) **The Sex Which is Not One** Ithaca Cornell University Press
- Jameson F. 91992) **Post modernism or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism** Mentor New York
- Jaynes G (1986) **Branches Without Roots** New York OUP
- Jensop B. (1990) **State Theory** Pennsylvania State University Press, Philadelphia

- 
- Kant E. (1956) **The Critique of Judgment** London OUP
- Kant E. (1958) **Prolegomena to Any Future Metaphysics** New York Harper.
- Kant E. (1966) **The Critique of Pure Reason** New York Harper
- Kay G. and Mott J. (1982) **Political Order and the Law of Labour** London, Macmillan
- Kay G.B. (1975) **Development and Underdevelopment: A Marxist Analysis** London Macmillan
- Keat R. (1993) "The Moral Boundaries of the Market" in C. Grouch and J. Marquand (ed) **Ethics and Markets** Oxford Basil Blackwell p.16-20.
- Keat R. (et al, ed) 1994 **The Authority of the Consumer** London Routledge
- Kelly R. (1998) "New Liberalism Revisited" **Capital and Class** No.64 p.63-89.
- King G. and Verba S. (1994) **Designing Social Inquiry** Princeton, Princeton University Press
- Klinger C. (2004) "From Freedom Without Choice to Choice Without Freedom" **Constellation** Vol. 11 No.1 p121-139
- Lash D. and J. Urry (1998) **Unorganized Capitalism** Cambridge Polity
- Laswell H. (1950) **Politics: Who Gets What, When, How** New York Smith
- Lenn V. I. (1962) **Imperialism, the Highest stage of Capitalism** Peking. People's Publishing House
- Lindholm (1965) **The Intelligence of Democracy** New York The Free Press.
- Lings M. (1997) **Muhammad: His Life Based on the Earliest Sources** Suhail Academy, Lahore
- Locke J. (1967) **Second Treatise of Government** London Cambridge University Press.

- 
- Lucas R. (1998) "Economic Policy Evaluation" in K. Brenner A. Meltzer (eds.) **The Philips Curve and Labour Markets** Amsterdam North Holland p. 73-94
- Luhmann N. (1989) "Stat und statreason in abergang von traditionaller Herschaft zn modermer politick" **Genselschaft und Semantic** vol 1, Frankfurt Subrkamp pp.65-148.
- Lyotard J-P (1979) **The Post Modern Condition** Bloomington University of Minneapolis Press
- Machiaveli B. (1973) **The Prince** New York Basic Books
- MacIntyre A. (1981) **After Virtue** Notre Dame University of Notre Dame Press
- Mahdi M. S. (2001) **Al Farabi and the Foundations of Islamic Political Philosophy** New York Oxford University Press
- Mann M. (1999) "The Dark Side of Democracy" **New Left Review** 1:255 p18-45
- Marx K. (1963) **Early Writings** (ed T. Bottomore) Penguin Harmonsworth
- Marx K. (1966) **Theories of Surplus Value** Peking. People's Publishing House.
- Marx K. (1967) "Notes on James Mill" in D. McLallar (ed.) **Karl Marx Early Texts** London Macmillan.
- Marx K. (1971) **Capital Vol. 1** Harmondsworth Penguin
- Marx K. (1973) **Grandrisse** Harmondsworth, Penguin
- Marx K. (1974) **Capital Vol. III** Harmondsworth Penguin
- Maududi A. A. (1999) **Islami Riyasat** Lahore Islamic Publication
- Maududi A.A. (1961) **Insan ka Maashi Masala Aur Uska Islami Hal** Lahore Islamic Publication
- Maududi A.A. (1963) **Sood** Lahore Islamic Publications

---

Meek R. (1976) **Social Sciences and the Ignoble Savage** London Cambridge University Press

Meszaros I. (1993) **Beyond Capital** - London Merlin

Mill J.S. (1960) **On Liberty** London Dent

Mishil M. (1997) **The State of Working America (1996-1999)** New York Sharp

Moran M. (1991) **The Political Economy of the Financial Services Revolution** New York Colombia University Press

Mosley R. (1999) "The Rate of Profit and the Future of Capitalism" **Review of Radical Political Economy** No. 29 p23-41.

Nietzsche F (1973) **Beyond Good and Evil** Harmondsworth Penguin

Nietzsche F. (1968) **The Will to Power** (Translators W. Kaufman and R. S. Hollingdale Harper New York).

Nietzsche F. (1974) **The Gay Science**, Allen and Unwin London

Pannitch L. (2000) "The New Imperial State" **New Left Review** II.2. p5-20.

Peterson W. (1999) "Gray Dawn" **Foreign Affairs** Vol.78 No.1 p42-55.

Pickthall M. (1959) **The Glorious Quran** New York Mentor

Pickthall M. (1960) **Islamic Culture** Lahore Sh. Muhamamd Ashraf

Polanyi J (1949) **The Great Transformation**: Boston Beacon Press

Popper K (1971) **Objective Knowledge** London OUP

Poulantzis N. (1995) **Classes in Contemporary Capitalism** London Verso.

Qutb S. (1973) **Jada-oManzil** (Urdu translation of **Ma'alim fit Tariq** Lahore, Islamic Publications

- 
- Rajchman I. (1991) Truth and Eros New York Routledge
- Rawls J. (1971) A Theory of Justice London, Oxford
- Rawls J. (1985) Political Liberalism Oxford Blackwell
- Recktenwal h. (ed.) (1973) Political Economy: a historical perspective London Collier Macmillan
- Rehg W. (1994) Insight and Solidarity Berkeley University of California Press.
- Rice D. (1986) The Tragedy of Politics New Haven Yale University Press
- Rizvi A. (2002) "From the Death of God to the Death of Man Towards A New Genealogy of Western Civilization" Pakistan Business Review Vol. IV No.2 p33-64
- Rizvi A. (2003) "Rawls Habermas Debate : A Ghazalian Perspective" Pakistan Business Review Vol. 5 No. 2 p3-20
- Rizvi A. A. (2002) "Methodology Underlying Ghazali's Critique of Greek Philosophy (mimeo)
- Rizvi A. A. (2004) "The Dangers of Foucault: A Ghazalian Critique" (forthcoming
- Rizvi A. M. (2001) 'Amriki dastur ka Islami muhakma' Sahil 13.6/7 p.11-45
- Rizvi A.M. (2000) "Zillai hukumatun ka alami istimari mansuba" Sahil Vol. 12 No.6 pp.6-12.
- Rizvi A.M. (2001) Foucauldian Struggles College of Business Management Karachi (forthcoming)
- Roberts J.M. (1997) The Penguin History of the World Harmondsworth Allen Lane
- Rodrik D. (1998) Has Globalization Gone Too Fair Washington NIESR.
- Roemer J. (1996) A Future for Socialism New York Harper

- 
- Rorty R. (1998) Achieving Our Country Cambridge Harvard University Press
- Rose N. (1987) "Beyond the public-private division: law, power and the family" Journal of Law and Society Vol. 14 No.1 P61-76
- Rousseau J. (1954) Confessions (translation J. Cohen) London, Macmillan
- Ruttan V. (1998) "The New Growth Theory and Development Economics" Journal of Development Studies Vol. 30 No.-2 p1-26.
- Sandel M. (1982) Liberalism and the Limits of Justice London Cambridge University Press
- Sartre J.P. (1956) Being and Nothingness (Translator B. Barnes) London
- Schopenhauer A. (1974) Parerga and Paralipomena (translator E.F. Payne Oxford OUP)
- Schumpeter J. (1961) A History of Economic Analysis New York OUP
- Shariati A. (1979) Ravish-I-Shinakhat-I-Islam Hassanya-I-Irshad, Tehran
- Skinner Q. (1989) "State" in Ball T (ed) Political Innovation and Conceptual Change OUP London pp. 90-131.
- Smith A. (1981) The Wealth of Nations London Dent.
- Sogoff M. (1983) The Economics of the Earth OUP. London.
- Spencer H. (1904) An Autobiography London Vol.11 William and Noryab
- Strange S. (1989) "Towards A Theory of Transnational Empire" in F.O. Czempeil and J. Rosemau (ed.) Global Changes and Theoretical Challenge Lexington p.153-80
- Summers J. (1968) Ed. Ensays in Legal Philosophy Oxford Clarendon Press
- Suri A. W. (2004) "The Incoherneeces of Multiculturalism" Pakistan Business Review Vol. 6 No.1 p36-44.

---

Suri W. (1999) "Some Contradictions of Capitalist Democracy" **Pakistan Business Review** Vol.1 No.1 pp. 61-70.

Suri W. (2004) "Justifying Liberal Terrorism" **Pakistan Business Review** Vol.6 No.3 p44-61

Taylor C. (1997) **Sources of the Self** London Cambridge University Press

Thompson R. and P. Ackroyd (1998) "All Quiet on the Workplace Front" **Sociology** Vol. 29 pp. 615 - 633.

Touraine A. (1995) **The Critique of Modernity** Cambridge Blackwell

Tucker H. (1983) **Marx and Individualism** London Macmillan

U.N. (1999) **World Population Prospects : 1998 Review** New York

Usmani M. T. (1993) **Islam Aur Jadeed Maeeshat-o-Tijarat** Karachi Dar-ul-Ulum

Vogel S. (1996) **Freer Markets More Rules** Ithaca

Wade I. (1977) **The Structure and Form of the French Enlightenment** Princeton, Princeton University Press

Walzer N. (1997) **Spheres of Justice** OUP London.

Weiser F Van (1927). **Social Economics** London Allen and Union

Wittgenstein L. (1922) **Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus** (translator C. K.Ogden) Cambridge University Press London

Wittgenstein L. (1967) **Letters from Wittgenstein** P. Engelmann (ed) Oxford O.U.P.

World Bank (2000) **Attacking Poverty** Washington.

Zakaria F. (2003) **The Future of Freedom** New York Norton









